The Dissertation Committee for Allen Lamar McMurrey III certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Middle School Teachers, Certification, Classroom Management, and Student Discipline: A Study of Early Career Teachers in Central Texas Schools

Committee:

_____
Angela Valenzuela, Supervisor

_____
Richard Reddick

_____
Jennifer Holme

_____
Victor Saenz

_____
Rebecca Bigler

Middle School Teachers, Certification, Classroom Management, and Student Discipline: A Study of Early Career Teachers in Central Texas Schools

by

Allen Lamar McMurrey III, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May, 2015

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, my wife Gianna, my daughter Fiona, and my son Duncan. They have grown with me as I have worked through this process which has, at times, been challenging. Someone once told me that getting a doctorate was, in the end, a journey of self-discovery. I finally understand what they meant. Most of all, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my wife for encouraging me and challenging me to complete this journey. I could not have done this without you. Now begins another journey.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This whole program became a reality for me when Mr. David Underwood and Dr. Damon Wells CBE decided to help me pay for my first year of doctoral studies. Without their initial support this whole endeavor may not have happened. To Carolyn Ross, my Principal and colleague, who asked me what my future plans were after I finished my Masters. It was the snowflake that started the avalanche. To Dr. Angela Valenzuela, my eventual chair, who encouraged me to become an education policy student in order to have a greater impact in my future scholarship and my academic career. To Dr. Pedro Reyes, who was always there to support my work. And to my original chair, Dr. Julian Vasquez Heilig, whom I worked closely with to focus my myriad research interests into one field of study that I could research and write a dissertation on.

To my parents—Thank you for your encouragement and support. You may not have fully understood what it was that I was doing, but you were always promoting me whenever someone asked how I was getting along. To my committee—Dr. Angela Valenzuela, Dr. Jennifer Holme, Dr. Rickard Reddick, Dr. Victor Saenz, and Dr. Rebecca Bigler. Thanks to each of you for your own special brand of support and encouragement throughout my doctoral studies. It was a long journey and I am grateful to each of you for the part that you played to make this happen. Your time, expertise, and support have been invaluable.

To Hortensia Palomares—You were always there to answer every question, correct mistakes, and to do so much to ensure that it all got done. Thank you.

Abstract

Allen Lamar McMurrey III, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Angela Valenzuela

There has been a substantial amount of research conducted that has studied teacher quality in regards to the types of certification training that a teacher received to become a highly qualified teacher. Within the research literature on this subject were arguments that supported both sides of the traditional teacher certification versus alternative teacher certification debate. While many studies have looked at test scores and student achievement as the most important aspects of teacher quality, this study explored the relationship between teacher quality as it related to type of teacher certification and their classroom management and student discipline beliefs and practices. Taken into account were the very real consequences of teachers mismanaging their classrooms by over disciplining students many of whom were disproportionately economically disadvantaged, minority, at-risk, and special education students. This study investigated traditionally certified teachers and alternatively certified teachers in four central Texas urban and suburban school districts that each served a high number of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students. The schools that were used were all middle schools. The literature that was used to develop this study revealed variances in how traditionally certified and alternatively certified teachers are studied and how they are perceived.

The literature also revealed how classroom mismanagement via overuse of disciplinary referrals and suspensions for minor, discretionary infractions has had a detrimental effect on the academic outcomes of the most vulnerable students in our public schools. What this study does is add to the existing literature on teacher certification and teacher quality. How it was significant was that it stepped away from the more traditional, standardized test result based, or value added models of teacher certification studies by focusing on classroom management and discipline beliefs and practices of teachers new to the profession. This was a unique study in that it focused on the certification training and classroom management and student discipline beliefs and practices teachers new to the profession teaching in both urban and suburban middle school classrooms which served high numbers of poor, at-risk students. The study involved using a take home survey that asked teachers to provide basic demographic data about themselves, their certification programs, their challenges as new to the profession teachers, and how they felt about teaching in general. Included in the study were teacher's responses to video scenarios of students breaking discretionary rules which they viewed in a face to face meeting in their own classrooms. The data from these were examined to discern whether or not there was a discernible difference in the way each group of teachers felt about their preparedness to teach and how they rated the infractions played out in the student video scenarios.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

"Whatever the reasons for children's behavior—whether poverty, personality, a handicapping condition, a dysfunctional home, or an abusive environment—classroom teachers are responsible for managing children, seeing that they work together in a confined space for long periods, and ensuring that they learn" (p. 22).

Haberman (1995).

Classroom Management and Student Discipline

How important are classroom management and student discipline skills to a teacher's success in the classroom? Emmer and Stough (2001) asserted that good classroom management is viewed as a condition for student learning by allowing teachers to accomplish other important instructional goals. They concluded that classroom management represented a significant aspect of the teacher's pedagogical knowledge and was often found as a component of categorizations and descriptions of core knowledge for teachers. Some researchers suggested that novice teachers may need to have reached a minimum level of competency in classroom management skills before they were able to move forward in other areas of instruction (Emmer & Stough, 2001, p. 103).

Given that classroom management represent a significant aspect of a teacher's pedagogical knowledge, what part does classroom management play in overall student success? After the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, two significant mandates were handed down to schools. The first was that every classroom should be led by a highly qualified teacher; the second was that every school and classroom should be a safe haven from violence, abuse, drugs, and other crimes. A seemingly endless stream of state and federal reports argued that disciplinary problems in the classroom have distracted students and taken away from

valuable instruction time. This led to schools and teachers to adopt harsher and stricter codes of conduct which have had a deleterious effect on a significant amount of students (Losen, 2011).

What was not covered in No Child Left Behind (2001) was *how* we are going to prepare teachers to meet higher quality standards, standards which included some of the most difficult aspects of teaching to master: classroom management and student discipline. In pursuing the mandate of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom the federal government and the states affirmed that these were the rules, now go get it done. The opening quote in the introduction by Haberman (1995) encapsulated the understanding that teacher quality, or teacher effectiveness, was determined in several diverse areas outside of more traditional measurements, such as students' scores on standardized tests. Haberman (1995) specified that in addition to test scores, student success was also dependent upon a teacher's ability to establish and maintain an optimal learning environment in their classroom.

From the time when adults and children began interacting with each other in an academic or instructional atmosphere, the question of how to best manage the behaviors of students has confronted teachers. The challenge still exists today as classroom management has been cited as one of the primary concerns of teachers (Clement, 2002). Brophy (1988) defined classroom management as "the actions taken to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to attainment of the goals of instruction—arranging the physical environment of the classroom, establishing rules and procedures, maintaining attention to lessons and engagement in academic activities'' (p. 2). Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) contended that "teachers play various roles in a typical classroom, but surely one of the most important is that of classroom manager. Effective teaching and learning cannot take place in a poorly managed classroom"

(p. 1). Unfortunately, schools tend to trust that newly hired teachers will instinctually know how to manage their classrooms and deal with student discipline issues without much oversight or guidance. This is based on the antiquated notion that students will intuitively obey the teacher, control themselves, and follow school's code of conduct. An additional, and all too often common, misconception about teachers was that the newly hired, highly qualified, teacher would have designed lessons that were engaging and rigorous to the point that good student discipline and academic achievement would magically occur as byproducts. This antiquated thinking, that it was about the person teaching, rather than the training they received, was at the core of the push for highly qualified teachers in the No Child Left Behind Act.

With respect to student discipline, Cotton (1990) reported that "During most of its twenty-two year existence, the Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools has identified 'lack of discipline' as the most serious problem facing the nation's educational system" (p. 1). To meet these concerns, schools have developed harsher and harsher codes of discipline which usually involved some sort of removal of the offending student from the classroom and in-school or out of school suspension (Skiba & Peterson, 1999). Yet, while seemingly necessary, these disciplinary measures have proved to be controversial. Nichols (2004) asserted that there was no clear evidence that existed to suggest that in-school or out-of-school suspension did anything to curb future student misbehavior. Although the notion of providing a disciplinary outcome like in-school suspension may be seen as constructive as it supposedly provided a disciplinary consequence without disrupting the educational process, questions regarding the students' successful re-integration back into the classroom remained an issue when in school and out-of-school suspension occurred (Nichols, 2004, p. 409).

Along these lines, Skiba and Peterson (2000) argued:

> Well-defined disciplinary requirements and attention to school security have a place in schools in maintaining order and ensuring safety. Yet harsh and punitive disciplinary strategies have not proven sufficient to foster a school climate that can prevent the occurrence of school violence (p. 335).

These researchers pushed for a more progressive system of school discipline that offered schools and teachers a broader perspective, stressing early identification, comprehensive planning, prevention, and instruction in important social skills, which are necessary if schools were to prevent the tragedies that had occurred far too often in our schools (Skiba & Peterson, p. 336).

Teachers, parents, and students across the nation recognize that for schools to provide safe and positive classrooms, there must be rules that manage student conduct. To enforce schools' student codes of conduct effectively, most agree that teachers, especially those teachers new to the classroom, must have the tools, and the judgment to use those tools, to maintain order and help students to be successful in reaching their academic potential. Teachers new to the profession face immense challenges in the classroom, and managing the behavior of large groups of students each day can be an increasingly difficult assignment, but it is one that they have to master from the beginning with little or no training in effective classroom management and student discipline.

One of the unintended consequences of the focus on school discipline was that students of color increasingly found themselves the target of discriminatory disciplinary policies that made schools less conducive to learning and more a portal into disciplinary alternative education placements (DAEPs) and the juvenile justice system (Johnson & Caldwell, 2002). In a report

published by the Center for Public Integrity (2014), it was reported that across the nation, minority students of all ages were subjected to suspensions and expulsions at a rate three times the rate of their white peers. Black students, which represented 16% of overall enrollment, were more than a quarter of the students who were referred to law enforcement from schools that year and 31% of those taken into custody. Students with disabilities represented a quarter of the students arrested and referred to law enforcement although they were only 13% of the nation's student population. (Juvenile Justice Section, para. 11).

The overrepresentation of minority students in school punishment was by no means a new finding in school discipline research. According to Skiba, Michael, Nardo, and Peterson (2002), "investigations of a variety of school punishments over the past 25 years have consistently found evidence of socioeconomic and racial disproportionality in the administration of school discipline" (p. 318). Despite extensive documentation of the existence of racial, socioeconomic, and gender disparities in school discipline data, the meanings of these statistics remained unclear. The academic literature on this subject used for this study concluded that few studies to date have systematically explored possible explanations or reasons for disciplinary disproportionality (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002). St. George (2012) defined a system appropriately named the "school to prison pipeline" as "get-tough disciplinary practices that steer students out of schools—through suspension, expulsion or police involvement— and into the criminal justice system" (Education section, para. 6). What has rarely been studied is how teachers new to the profession, those with less than five years of teaching experience, manage their classrooms and handle student discipline. It is possible that a lack of preparation in their certification programs has led to their overuse of harsher disciplinary actions to control their

classrooms, which in turn has contributed to the rise in student disciplinary actions which often led to students being removed from the classroom.

This is an important area to study because of the harmful effect underprepared teachers could be having on students. What is not so well known is the role that teachers new to the profession may play in exacerbating the problem of overuse of student discipline practices in the classroom. According to Texas Appleseed (2010), Texas school discipline policies have resulted in the repeated and often harmful practice of removing students from the classroom, often for minor, discretionary offenses. Even when the state does not mandate expulsion of a student, it gives school districts the discretion to expel students for a range of offenses outlined in Chapter 37 of the Texas Education Code. Christle, Jolivette, and Nelson found that "consistent with other research findings, we also found a positive relationship between suspension rate and dropout. Schools that rely on exclusionary discipline practices—such as suspension—may actually be impeding the educational progress of students, perpetuating a failure cycle" (p. 333).

Taking into account the variables of teacher quality, teacher certification, and student discipline, a good question to ask at this point was: What is the relationship between teacher certification training, classroom management, and student discipline practices? Sokal, Smith, and Mowat (2003) argued that classroom management was the most common concern of both pre-service and experienced teachers. Underpinning these questions was the correlation between the ways teacher certification programs prepared teachers for the classroom and the rise of discretionary student disciplinary actions taken by teachers in our public schools. The purpose of this study was to look at the strength and direction of that relationship by studying teacher

preparation programs and actual teachers' views and practices where classroom management and student discipline were concerned.

It was assumed that all teachers graduating from certification programs were ready to manage their classrooms and handle the rigors of teaching various content areas. The key factor underlying this assumption was that the teacher preparation or training which the teacher received in their certification programs prepared them to teach their content, manage their classrooms, and handle student discipline. The research conducted in this area has looked at teacher certification and the various types of training that a teacher received to prepare for the classroom. In the studies undertaken by scholars such as Chetty, Friedman and Rockoff (2011), Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, Rockoff and Wyckoff, J (2008), Clotfelter, Ladd and Vigdor (2007), Goe, (2007), Goldhaber and Anthony (2007), Laczko-Kerr and Berliner (2002), Walsh (2001), and Fuller (1999), student achievement was the measure by which teacher quality was usually determined. However, the current study was unique in that it was designed to explore a different aspect of teacher quality: the role of the teacher as classroom manager and student disciplinarian, and the role that their initial teacher certification may have played in preparing them to be effective classroom mangers and student disciplinarians.

Teacher Quality and Teacher Certification

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB) ushered in a new era of accountability in education which had at its core, standards-based educational reform. These reforms were based on the use of state-developed assessments that relied upon state-developed educational standards that were to be included in curricula that was taught to students by highly qualified teachers (U.S.

Department of Education, 2011). In doing this, the United States Department of Education was seeking to directly address problems surrounding the issue of teacher quality:

> Around the country, education researchers were beginning to address similar questions. The testing mandates in No Child Left Behind had generated a sea of data, and researchers were now able to parse student achievement in ways they never had before. A new generation of economists devised statistical methods to measure the "value added" to a student's performance by almost every factor imaginable: class size versus per-pupil funding versus curriculum. When researchers ran the numbers in dozens of different studies, every factor under a school's control produced just a tiny impact, except for one: which teacher the student had been assigned to. (Green, 2010, para. 3)

Generally, policymakers advocate increasing the quality of teaching; but there is substantial debate about the best way to measure and improve teacher quality. The first step Texas and the other states undertook was put highly qualified teachers in every classroom. According to the Texas Education Code (2009):

> The commissioner may by rule establish a statewide standard to be used to certify each school district that is preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers in a manner consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 (Pub. L. No. 107-110). The No Child left Behind Act of 2001 states that a highly qualified teacher is one that must have: 1) a bachelor's degree, 2) full state certification or licensure, and 3) prove that they know each subject they teach. (Section 21.005)

The United States Department of Education in a report in No Child Left Behind stated that, to be considered highly qualified, a teacher must prove that they know the subject they teach with:

1) a major in the subject they teach, 2) credits equivalent to a major in the subject, 3) passage of a state-developed test, 4) Evaluation : NCLB allows states to develop an additional way for current teachers to demonstrate subject-matter competency and meet highly qualified teacher requirements. Proof may consist of a combination of teaching experience, professional development, and knowledge in the subject garnered over time in the profession, 5) an advanced certification from the state, or 6) a graduate degree. (United States Department of Education, 2011)

The State of Texas the Texas Education Code (2009) maintained that the preparation standards for these highly qualified teachers must be determined by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC). The SBEC (2011) stated that adequate teacher preparation, to be considered for state certification, must consist of a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university, appropriate teacher training through that college or university's educator preparation program, and successful completion of the appropriate teacher certification tests for the subject and grade level the candidate wishes to teach.

Highly Effective and Highly Qualified

Does being highly qualified, using the NCLB definition, mean that a teacher is also highly effective? A substantial amount of academic literature was found that focused on the various types of teacher certification as it related to teacher quality and teacher effectiveness (American Federation of Teachers, 2012; Ballou & Podgursky, 1998; Casey, Dunlap, Brister, & Davidson, 2011; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 1999, 2000, 2009; Darling-Hammnod, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Donaldson & Moore-Johnson, 2008; Feistritzer, 2005; Fuller, 1999; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007; Goodwin, Smith, Souto-Manning, Cheruvu,

Tan, Reed, & Taveras, 2014; Greenberg, Walsh, & McKee, 2014; Institute of Education Sciences. 2009; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; Fuller, 1999; Liston, Borko, & Whitcomb, 2008; Putnam, 2009; Shen, 1997; Walsh, 2001; Willett & Murnane, 2008; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001;). One of the major shortcomings of this research was that it relied too heavily on student test scores as a measure of teacher quality. In their groundbreaking study on teachers' impact on student test scores or the value added model Chetty, Friedman, and Rockoff (2012) argued that teacher quality can be measured using measures like test scores, college attendance, and their earning over their lifetimes. They concluded that "good teachers create substantial economic value and that test score impacts are helpful in identifying such teachers" (p. 51). What was not included in their research was an individual teacher's classroom management style or student discipline practices as a measure of teacher quality or student success.

Taking the Chetty, Freidman, and Rockoff (2012) research into account, there were several questions that need to be answered. First among them was: what roles do a teacher's classroom management style or their student discipline practices play in student achievement? With respect to this question, Laczko-Kerr and Berliner (2002) contended:

> There has been growing interest in "teacher quality, " a catch phrase for a host of teacher characteristics, including a teacher's content knowledge, classroom behavior, academic ability, advanced degree work, salary, and teacher education experiences. Among the many characteristics under investigation as an indicator of teacher quality has been teacher certification. (p. 2)

Secondly, which teachers, those who are traditionally certified or those who are alternatively certified, are better prepared to manage classrooms and handle student discipline issues?

Teacher Certification

After the landmark No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 was passed, teachers in every state had to meet the highly qualified requirements specified under the law. NCLB essentially sought to raise student achievement nationwide, and part of this goal required every student in every classroom to be taught by a highly qualified teacher. This meant that all classroom teachers had to meet basic qualifications, which included a college degree and state teacher certification, to be considered highly qualified to teach. The law did not stipulate what *type* of certification a teacher had to possess, only that they be certified to teach in the state that employed them. This definition of highly qualified was problematic in that individual states were allowed to devise their own teacher certification requirements. Among these requirements were a number of alternative pathways to certification which varied greatly in their coursework and the amount of time, if any, a teacher candidate spent as a student teacher. While having a university degree and some form of state teaching credential, though easy to measure from state databases, these measures did not tell us enough about a teacher's knowledge or pedagogical skill set. In short, the main problem with the state and federal definition of teacher quality set too low a bar for teacher knowledge by focusing on input measures rather than including output measures into the equation.

On this point, Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, Rockoff, and Wyckoff (2008) argued:

> Disparities in teacher qualifications figure prominently in most educational policy discussions and are a central feature of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which requires a 'highly qualified teacher' in every classroom in a core academic subject (p. 793).

The problem was defining and measuring quality with regard to the individual teacher's training and their practices in the classroom. Defining teacher quality has been problematic on several levels. When describing teacher quality, the terms usually used are *highly effective teacher*, *highly qualified teacher*, and *helpful or reliable teacher*. These descriptions tended to focus on personal or professional characteristics, qualifications or certifications, teaching practices, and student achievement or student academic outcomes. They were all generally helpful in describing the teacher, yet none of these terms adequately defined teacher quality. Discussions regarding teacher quality tended to center around certification type and student achievement. According to Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor (2007), education researchers and policy makers agreed that teachers differed in terms of quality and that quality mattered for student achievement. Despite vast amounts of research, however, debate still persisted about the underlying relationship between specific types of teacher certification and student achievement (Clotfelter & Vigdor, 2007, p. 2).

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), a teacher certification program accrediting body, recognized the critical substantive role that individual preparation programs played in accreditation (2013). They indicated that in order to meet their rigorous standards a teacher preparation program must be proficient in the following areas: candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; assessment system and unit evaluation; field experiences and clinical practice; diversity; faculty qualifications, performance, and development; unit governance and resources (Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation -CAEP, 2013, p. 15)

Researchers and classroom teachers agree that more could be done to prepare teachers for the realities of the classroom and to make them more effective or higher-quality educators. As Darling-Hammond (2002) contended that for at least a decade, two contending trends have influenced the education workforce. Calls for reform from organizations like the Carnegie Task Force on the Future of Teaching (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) of education deans prompted many universities to strengthen their teacher preparation programs by requiring more content area preparation, more concentrated coursework on pedagogy and strategies for meeting the unique needs of diverse learners, and more methodical and connected clinical experiences. Some universities had developed five-year models that included a disciplinary major and rigorous training for teaching, including a year of supervised student teaching. There was evidence which suggested that these efforts may have produced teachers who felt better prepared, who entered the profession and stayed in the teaching filed longer, and who were often rated as more effective educators (Darling-Hammond, 2002, pp. 286-287).

Does it matter what type of teacher preparation program at teacher went through in their route to the classroom? Darling-Hammond (2000) argued that reviews of research over the past several decades have concluded that even with the inadequacies of current teacher education and certification, adequately prepared and certified teachers are largely better rated and more effective with students than teachers without similar certification preparation (Darling Hammond, 2000, p. 167).

What does a teacher's certification type matter when it comes to student achievement? In a study conducted on Texas students, Fuller (1999) concluded that "students in districts with greater proportions of fully licensed teachers were significantly more likely to pass the Texas

state achievement tests after controlling for student socioeconomic status, school wealth, and teacher experience" (p. 11).

The sections that follow serve as an overview of what the research used in this study says about traditional teacher certification programs and alternative teacher certification programs. The main focus is on how each type of program prepares teachers to be highly qualified to teach when they enter the classroom.

Traditional Teacher Certification. Generally speaking, traditional teacher certification programs vary from state to state, but they are similar in that at the end of the program, the teacher candidate is considered by the college or university to be ready to teach. Although traditional certification programs vary in how they certify teaching candidates, they largely share a number of common features. Traditionally, certified teachers are those who successfully complete a four or five-year university or college-based program which teaches student-teachers the basic skills and pedagogical knowledge they will need to enter the profession. Included in the program was a student teaching component overseen by the college and situated in cooperating public schools. In support of traditional teacher certification, Ravitch (2013) asserted that teachers should have a year of study, research, and practice teaching before they are allowed to teach. Upon completion of their teaching programs, teacher candidates must then take and pass a series of state mandated licensure exams before being certified to teach. Texas requires that teacher candidates must show competency in their chosen subject on the TExES content area exam, as well as pass a test on general pedagogy and professional skills known as the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities test (Educational Testing Service, 2012). Levine (2006) suggested that traditional certification programs approached teaching as a profession

much like becoming a doctor or lawyer. This meant that the traditional programs were composed of a regulated set of requirements and curricula that pushed high expectations and promoted professionalism. In all likelihood, the course requirements of the program included courses on pedagogy and practice, theoretical frameworks of education, content area courses, as well as child development and psychology. Ravitch (2013) in reference to teacher certification programs suggested:

> In addition to knowing their subject, they should learn how to teach, how to manage the classroom, how to deal with disruptive behavior, how to educate students with special needs, and how to engage parents to help their children. There is much more that they should learn—about the history, philosophy, and politics of education, about cognitive psychology, and about the sociology of education. (p. 141)

Darling-Hammond (2000) noted that where teachers new to the profession are concerned, "the least well-prepared recruits are disproportionately assigned to teach the least advantaged students in high minority and low-income schools" (p. 168).

Alternative Teacher Certification. Beginning in the 1980s, in an effort to address chronic teacher shortages, fast track routes to teacher certification, known as alternative certification programs, opened up in many states (Feistritzer & Emily, 2005). Since that time, alternative routes to teacher certification have expanded. Levine (2006) pointed out that, unlike other professions such as the legal profession, medicine, or business management, there was not one required license to be a teacher; that in fact, there were many. In 2004, according to a United States Department of Education publication titled, *Innovations in Education: Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification*, "43 states plus the District of Columbia reported having some

type of alternative route for certifying teachers, while only eight states said they had such routes in 1983 when the National Center for Education Information began collecting such data" (United States Department of education, 2004, p. 4). The same report stated that "In states like California, New Jersey, and Texas that have been pursuing alternative routes since the mid-1980s, twenty percent or more of new teachers enter the profession through alternative routes; Texas offers fifty two separate routes" (United States Department of Education, 2004, p. 4).

Alternative certification programs in Texas typically range from several semesters of training prior to a full-time teaching position, to two years of coursework and subsequent mentoring by master teachers. These differences in program requirements were precisely what made alternative teacher preparation programs so hard to study. The agencies responsible for overseeing and implementing the alternative certification programs varied from the Texas Education Agency, regional education service centers, traditional and for-profit universities, accredited online providers, or organizations like Teach For America. Although the various programs differed in course requirements and student teaching opportunities, upon completion they all produced the same product, a highly qualified, fully certified teacher.

An example of what constitutes an alternative teacher certification program is Teach For America. The Teach For America program sought to address the shortage of properly trained teachers, especially in areas that serve large numbers of economically disadvantaged students, by providing a fast track to teacher certification for recent college graduates who sought to serve the community by becoming teachers. The Teach for America program was introduced in 1990 by Princeton University senior Wendy Kopp. This program was designed to provide a critical source of well-trained teachers who are helping break the cycle of educational inequity (Teach

For America, 2012). One of the key differences that set Teach For America apart from more traditional, college-based teacher certification programs was that they acknowledged that they were sending their teacher candidates into schools which served economically disadvantaged and at-risk students with the primary goal being to close persistent achievement gaps (Teach For America, 2012, n.d.).

Since it was created in 1990, Teach For America has operated as a nonprofit dedicated to training and certifying, through an alternative certification process, teachers to serve in some of our nation's poorest schools and communities. What originally began as Ms. Kopp's senior thesis at Princeton blossomed into a national organization that serves schools in 39 rural and urban regions (over 500,000 students) annually. There are over 28,000 corps members/teachers and staff currently working in schools or running the day to day operations of Teach for America (Teach For America, 2012).

In a policy brief by Julian Vasquez Heilig and Su Jin Jez (2010), which looked at the effectiveness of Teach For America, it was reported that the Teach For America teacher candidates do not perform as well, in some cases only marginally better than their traditional teacher counterparts. It was also noted that the high turnover in Teach For America teacher candidates (they are only required to teach two years) was costly to schools in that they had to rehire and retrain replacements. As a result of their research Vasquez Heilig and Jez (2010) concluded that "TFA is likely not the panacea that will reduce disparities in educational outcomes" (p. 14). They further stated that in their comparisons between Teach For America teacher candidates and credentialed/certified teachers, that "the students of novice TFA teachers perform significantly less well in reading and mathematics than those of credentialed beginning

teachers" (p. 5). The implication is that students are more likely better off with a certified teaching professional than with a well-intentioned Teach For America member.

Teacher Certification Programs in Texas. Texas public schools serve 5,058, 939 students and employs 327,419 teachers to teach them. Of these teachers 85,475 have taught for less than five years (Texas Education Agency, AEIS, 2013). Each of these teachers completed a teacher certification program in order to be considered highly qualified to teach and to be hired to teach in a Texas public school. In Texas and in other states, there were two routes to certification: alternative teacher certification and traditional teacher certification. Traditional certification programs in Texas are ones that are overseen and managed by public and private colleges and universities. In central Texas, the location of the study undertaken for this dissertation, traditional certification programs were university-based programs that are offered by colleges and universities as part of an undergraduate degree program. The traditional teacher preparation programs researched for this study consisted of a four-year Bachelor's degree plan that included courses in general education, a specialized certification area, professional education and pedagogy courses, and a student teaching component that was supervised by university program personnel and participating classroom teachers. Certification areas in a traditional teacher preparation program were early childhood Education (grades PK-3), elementary education (grades 1-5), middle School Education (grades 4-8), and secondary education (grades 6-12). The middle school education and secondary education programs prepared teachers in the specific content areas they would be responsible for teaching. The traditional teacher certification program usually took four to six years to complete. On completion of their university course work, the traditional teacher candidate would take the qualifying Texas

Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) exams. Traditional teacher certification programs often required a teacher candidate to complete one or two semesters of field experience/student teaching in a local school district. Once they complete the program requirements and the teacher pass certification tests, the teacher candidate then becomes a highly qualified, certified teacher in Texas (State Board of Educator Certification, 2011).

The Texas alternative certification programs used in this study were rather ambiguous in nature in that there was such a variance in programs. Alternative certification programs in Texas and elsewhere differed from the traditional certification programs in admission requirements, overall goals and objectives, and pre-service or student teaching requirements than. The individual programs also varied in regards to cost, required coursework, and teacher support outside of the classroom. Alternative certification programs in Texas varied in what each program required of their students

Although alternative certification programs in Texas had different approaches than Teach For America, they had a similar goal: to get the teacher candidate into the classroom as quickly as possible, something that traditional certification programs could not do, given their coursework and student teaching requirements. The Dallas Independent School district had its own certification program, despite the Region 10 Education Service Center having its own alternative teacher certification program. The ESC programs that were researched for this study had the following traits in common: Pre-service classes (both blended and online) that prepared the student to pass the state mandated TExES content and pedagogy and professional responsibility tests which were followed by a ten-month, supervised, paid internship teaching in a classroom on a probationary teaching certificate, or a twelve week, unpaid, clinical teaching

assignment where the student co-taught with a certified teacher (Dallas ISD, ESC Region 4, ESC Region 10, ESC Region 13, ESC ESC Region 19, Region 20, 2013). The individual programs varied in the coursework they required, but it was worth noting that only one had specific course related to classroom management.

The central Texas based alternative teacher certification programs researched for this study involved similar online coursework and internships, as well as clinical teaching programs resembling the ESC programs in other regions of the state. Examples of these programs include the Lamar University Post Baccalaureate Alternative Certification Route (PACeR), iTeach, Educators of Excellence, and A + Texas Teachers. It was worth noting that none of these online programs offer classes in classroom management, and only one of them, iTeach, is National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education accredited.

Hawley (1990) pointed out that "the distinguishing characteristic of alternative certification programs was their intent to provide access to a teaching credential that essentially circumvents participation in conventional or traditional college or university-based preparation programs" (p. 5). According to an article on alternative teacher certification written by Jo Lynn Suell and Chris Piotrowski (2007), alternative teacher certification programs (ATEPs) have been a contentious topic since their inception. The state of Virginia established the first statewide ATEP program in 1982. California followed suit in 1983, and Texas and New Jersey began their alternative teacher certification programs in 1984. Since that time alternative certification programs have been growing at a rapid pace. By 2002, at least 45 states offered alternative routes to certification. Of these, 20 states have developed 34 new ATEPs in the last 5 years. (Suell, J.L., & Piotrowski, C., 2007, p. 54)

Unfortunately, too many inexperienced, traditionally and alternatively certified teachers ended up teaching in schools attended by large numbers of economically disadvantaged, at-risk students with which they may have had little or no experience working. Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, and Wheeler (2006) argued that "no matter how effective such teachers may ultimately become, their inexperience in the early years of their teaching careers typically renders them less effective than their more experienced counterparts" (p. 1,354).

Adding to this concern is that an unprepared, under-qualified teacher will wind up mismanaging a classroom through overuse of disciplinary referrals as a way to assert their control over students. The potential consequences of classroom mismanagement are worrisome, but should an under-qualified teacher find themselves in a classroom populated by minority students, economically disadvantaged students, and other challenging demographics the impact of these potentially harmful consequences multiply exponentially. Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera (2010) published an article that combined research on racial patterns in school discipline and considered how disproportionate disciplinary actions might have contributed to under achievement among students of color. It further examined the evidence for student, school, and environmental contributors to the racial patterns in school disciplinary decisions. A significant finding was that that "poor students of color are more likely to attend schools with lower quality resources and facilities, higher teacher turnover, and a lower percentage of highly qualified teachers" (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010, p. 61). This same report found that in school districts throughout the United States, African American, Latino, and American Indian students are also subject to a differential and disproportionate rate of school disciplinary sanctions,

ranging from office disciplinary referrals to corporal punishment, suspension, and expulsion (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010, p. 59).

Taking all of this certification program research into teacher certification programs into account, there were several questions left unanswered. The first question that we must ask is what relationship there was between the teacher training and certification program attended, and the ways in which they handle classroom management and student discipline.

Participants of Current Study

The participants in the study were early career teachers in four central Texas school districts. Central Texas was chosen for the study because contained a good mix of urban and suburban schools which served diverse student populations. Early career teachers, as they were defined in this study, were teachers who had been in the classroom for five years or less. The schools that were used are all middle schools that served grades six through eight.

Sites of Study

Some of the schools chosen were suburban schools, schools which recent studies had shown to serve a growing population of poor, minority families. In a 2010 Brookings Institution study on the state of metropolitan life in America, it was stated that suburbs are home to the fastest growing and largest poor population in the country (Brookings Institution, 2010, p. 33). According to the Brookings (2010) report between 1999 and 2008, the suburban poor population grew by 25 percent—almost five times the growth rate of the primary city poor—so that by 2008 suburbs were home to almost one-third of the country's poor population, and 1.5 million more poor than primary cities (p.133). Suburban schools which used to be seen by White, middle and

upper class families as a refuge from urban schools were beginning to mirror or eclipse their urban counterparts where student and community demographics were concerned.

Theoretical Framework

The interpretation of the collected data is guided by Human Capital Theory. Specifically, the study draws upon the research of Sweetland (1996), Becker (1993), and Blaug (1976). The study looks at the certification programs teachers chose to become highly qualified teachers and whether or not those programs adequately prepared them to become capable classroom mangers and student disciplinarians. By applying human capital theory to teachers and teacher certification, two different variables have to be considered: 1) the human capital investment made by the teacher seeking to become a highly qualified, fully certified teacher, and 2) the human capital investment made by the states that oversee teacher certification programs and school districts that hire newly certified teachers.

Research Questions

The research questions that were chosen for this dissertation centered on the classroom management and discipline beliefs and practices of traditionally certified and alternatively certified novice middle school teachers new to the teaching profession. The category *teachers new to the profession* for the purpose of this study was defined as those teachers with five or less years of experience in the classroom. The following questions guided the study:

1. What are the differences, if any, between the way traditionally certified and alternatively certified middle school teachers who are new to the profession handle classroom management and discipline?

2. How do teachers who are new to the profession (1-to 5 years of experience) view their preparedness to manage their classrooms and their ability to deal with student disciplinary issues?

Summary

Chapter One focused on the problems associated with student discipline policies, the harmful effects associated with students discipline practices, and the unique relationship between teacher quality, classroom management, and student discipline. I established that these are critical issues as they relate to teacher certification preparation and teacher quality. The following chapter will offer a detailed literature review focusing on teacher quality, teacher certification programs, and Human Capital Theory. This will be followed by chapters covering the methodology used in the study, the data collected, and the findings.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature used in this study addressed several distinct areas. The first section looked at what the current research had to say about teacher quality and the intersection between teacher quality, classroom management, and problems related to student discipline. The second area looked at teacher quality as it relates to human capital theory. This was followed by a section on the literature that used teacher preparation and certification as a measure of potential quality. The literature was relevant to this study in that it got at the heart of the issue: what was the relationship, if any, between the way teachers were prepared for certification and the ways in which they handled classroom management and student discipline. To begin with, a review of the literature on teacher quality served as a preface to the issues concerning teacher certification type, classroom management, and student discipline.

Teacher Quality and Student Success

Defining teacher quality proved to be difficult researchers' respective definitions of teacher quality tended to vary from study to study. Descriptive terms that stuck out in the literature surrounding teacher quality were: highly qualified teacher, highly effective teacher, and the rather ambiguous term, good teacher. All three definitions focused on teacher qualifications, which in turn were based on the type of certification a teacher had, the degree they had earned, their individual pedagogical practices or classroom management skills, and student academic outcomes, such as student achievement as measured by test scores. Policy-makers had advocated for increasing the quality of teaching and improving the teaching profession overall; but there continued to be considerable debate about the best ways to measure overall teacher quality. As was stated earlier in this study, the No Child Left Behind Act and the State of Texas

had clearly defined a highly qualified teacher as one who had a college degree, a teaching certificate recognized by the state in which he/she taught, and working knowledge of the subject that they were responsible for teaching. Some of the literature surrounding teacher quality asked if these metrics were enough, and did these qualifications necessarily make one a high-quality teacher? Goldhaber and Anthony (2007) pointed out that the impact of having a high-quality teacher can be profound, adding that "a growing body of research shows that the quality of the teacher in the classroom is the most important schooling factor predicting student outcomes" (p. 4).

The research did find that having a good teacher was important, and that having a good teacher significantly improved a student's academic progress (Goldhaber & Brewer 2000; Hanushek, 1986, 1997). One prominent method used in evaluating teacher quality was to base their effectiveness on their students' standardized test scores. Other methods, such as the value-added model scores (VAMs) promoted by researchers Chetty, Friedman, and Rockoff (2011) not only took test scores into account, they looked at how students fared throughout their lives, by examining student factors like college attendance, rankings of the colleges attended, and lifetime earnings. However, a 2011 policy paper by Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, and Rothstein argued that there was a weak correlation between a teacher's value-added model scores and their overall effectiveness as teachers. They concluded that VAMs based on student test scores were problematic for making evaluation decisions for individual teachers; but they were useful for looking at groups of teachers for research purposes. For example, to examine how specific teaching practices or measures of teaching influence the learning of large numbers of students (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, p. 6).

Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) argued against using test scores as the only measure for teacher quality. They maintained that in order to determine teacher quality, the following areas must be considered: 1) general academic and verbal ability, 2) subject matter knowledge, 3) knowledge about teaching and learning as reflected in teacher education courses or preparation experiences; 4) teaching experience, and 5) the combined set of qualifications measured by teacher certification, which includes most of the preceding factors (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002)

In a report by the Measures of Effective Teaching Project (2013), it was suggested that a more effective and fair way to evaluate teachers was to quit using test scores as the only means by which to gauge teacher effectiveness and teacher quality. The report suggested that three vital measures should be used for teacher evaluation. These three were: observations of veteran teachers by novice teachers, student surveys of their teachers, and use of students' individual test scores. The Measures of Effective Teaching Project (2013) advocated for the implementation of classroom observation instruments, which included both subject-specific and cross-subject tools, defining discrete teaching competencies and described different levels of performance for each. These included student perception surveys that assessed key characteristics of the classroom environment, included supportiveness, and classroom management skills; and student achievement gains on state tests and development of more cognitively challenging assessments. The report concluded that measures which sought to determine teacher quality should have included multiple observations by administrators, fellow teachers, and outsiders familiar with teaching and classroom management, as well as student perception surveys. In their 2007 policy brief titled "Strengthening Teacher Quality in High-Need Schools—Policy and Practice,"

Darling-Hammond and Prince (2007) outlined several key areas of research on teacher effectiveness, based on teacher ratings and student achievement gains, and found the following teacher effectiveness qualities important. First were strong general academic and verbal abilities, which helped teachers in arranging and explaining ideas, as well as keen observation skills and the ability to think diagnostically. These were followed by strong content knowledge and an ability to make what was being taught relevant to all students. An additional requirement was knowledge of how to teach all levels of students in that area (content pedagogy), in particular how to use a variety of learning techniques as well as an ability to develop higher-order thinking skills. Additional qualities included an understanding of learners and their development including how to assess and scaffold learning, how to support students who have learning differences or difficulties, and how to support the learning of language and content for those who are not already proficient in the language of instruction. To round out the list, Darling-Hammond and (2007) included adaptive expertise which allowed teachers to make judgments about what was likely to work in a given context in response to students' needs (p. 4).

Taking into account the various qualities and definitions that described teacher quality, Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) suggested that we compare the various paths a college student or someone with a degree who had an interest in becoming a teacher would take to become a certified teacher. In order to do that, it was necessary to examine how we defined high quality teachers and the teacher certification processes that created these teachers.

An additional quality that teacher candidates should have is compassion or what Noddings (1984) referred to as an "ethic of care" (p. 700). Valenzuela (2010) pointed out that despite their perceiving of themselves as caring, many teachers unconsciously convey a different

message to their colleagues as well as to their students (p. 64). This can be seen in new teacher struggling to prove themselves as competent teachers by strictly enforcing school rules and disciplinary policies, while at the same time trying to get their students to like or respect them. Balfanz and Legters (2004) stipulated that all students should attend schools that would educate them, challenge them, care for them, and support them. In reviewing the literature surrounding teacher education programs, there was a great deal to found regarding educating and challenging students in certification programs, but almost nothing on caring for and supporting students, elements that Wetz (2010) argues are "central to the task of learning" (p. 5).

Teacher Quality Classroom Management and Student Discipline. The research into the relationship between teacher certification training and school discipline proved not to be as thorough as the research pertaining to teacher certification type and student test scores. The variable that was be used in this study to measure the differences between traditionally certified teachers and alternatively certified teachers was classroom management style; specifically, how each type of teacher handled disciplinary issues. This was an important distinction in that it went beyond looking at test scores and other similar measures that had typically defined teacher quality in the past.

In their 2007 synthesis of 21 research studies surrounding teacher quality and student outcomes, Suell and Piotrowski (2007) found that only two of the studies conducted counted classroom management and student discipline practices as variables which contributed to teacher quality and positive student outcomes. The rest of the studies focused on various state and national test scores to measure teacher quality. Because effective classroom management was hard to quantify, it had taken a backseat to student test scores when it came to measuring teacher

quality. Emmer and Stough (2001) affirmed that it made sense to include student behavioral outcomes as criteria for defining teacher quality or effectiveness in that they could be empirically connected to student achievement outcomes. In their view, it made sense that students must be engaged in order for meaningful learning to happen. Consequently on-task behavior should be a logical goal of classroom management. Additionally, unruly behavior tended to interfere with direct instruction and other classroom activities, which distracted other students from learning. The conclusion being that good classroom management was viewed as a prime condition for student learning, a condition which allowed teachers to accomplish other important instructional goals. (p. 104)

On a similar note, Goe (2002) conducted a study looking at the relationship between teacher quality and student outcomes. Her multiple regression analysis of teacher quality factors found a small but significant negative correlation between student achievement and the percentage of emergency-permit teachers. Goe's final analysis of the findings led her to conclude that schools that served large numbers of at risk students typically had these two factors: low student achievement, and many inexperienced teachers. She concluded by stating that it is possible that an unspecified, hidden variable might explain the relationship between the two. One of the primary goals of my study was to suggest that the unspecified, hidden variable which Goe (2002) referred to was teacher certification training.

In a study of traditionally certified and alternatively certified novice teachers, Wayman, Foster, Mantle-Bromley, and Wilson (2003) found that when they compared the teaching concerns of their subjects, the area of biggest concern for the alternatively certified teachers was effective instruction and classroom management (p. 38). This is of major importance to this

study in that a large group of alternatively certified teachers used in that study (N= 154) reported that they were concerned about pedagogical matters. Specifically, they were concerned about teacher effectiveness and classroom management. It was worth noting that the alternatively certified teachers in this study were compared to a larger group of traditionally certified teachers (N= 237) who did not reflect the same concerns of pedagogical skills and teacher effectiveness.

There has been considerable research on the many factors that appeared to put children at risk of disciplinary actions and contact with the juvenile justice system. Where there was a lack of research, and why this study was so important, was research that focused on the role that teacher certification might play in putting so many students at risk via disciplinary actions, such as referrals and suspensions for minor, or discretionary offenses. The overuse of disciplinary actions such as suspensions or placement in an alternative education facility or DAEP has proven to have a harmful effect on student learning outcomes, especially where students of color and special education students are concerned. According to Fabelo, Thompson, Plotkin, Carmichael, Marchbanks, and Booth (2001) study after study had found that African-American students experienced expulsion at disproportionately high rates and that socio-economic factors increased children's likelihood of experiencing suspension and expulsion, adding that boys were disciplined more frequently than girls.

Why these students are being suspended and the harmful effects of disciplinary actions taken for discretionary offenses were additional areas of research that has gained more and more traction over the years. Jordan (1994) used data collected from a 1988 National Education Longitudinal Study of 25,000 eight graders in 1,000 schools conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, and found a connection between student discipline practices and African

American male achievement in middle schools. They emphasized that "the time teachers spend handling disciplinary problems is time taken away from instruction; Black male achievement suffers as a result" (Jordan, 1994, p. 585). Apparently, when students are removed from the learning environment because of disciplinary practices and policies, such as in school and out of school suspension and expulsion, they suffer academically.

Losen and Martinez (2013) established that "most out of school suspensions are for minor offenses," and that research in this area demonstrated that the frequent use of suspensions were detrimental to school and community safety, in that they led to student disengagement, which in turn led to distrust between students and adults. Losen and Martinez (2013) concluded that an overuse of, or overreliance on, out of school suspensions as a disciplinary tool often led to students failing or dropping out. Furthermore, Losen and Martinez (2013) suggest that the tremendous disparities in the use of suspension at the secondary level may violate the civil rights of minority students. Comparably, Skiba, Michael, Nardo, and Peterson (2002) analyzed disciplinary referral documents of 11,001 students in 19 middle schools in a large, urban Midwestern public school district in the 1994–1995 academic year. Skiba et al. described a "differential pattern of treatment, originating at the classroom level, wherein African American students are referred to the office for infractions that are more subjective in interpretation" (p. 317). In other words, if an African American student *talked back* or was disrespectful to a teacher, the teacher interpreted this behavior as intolerable, and punished the student.

Human Capital Theory and Teacher Certification

Human capital is the education, training, and ability or experience that people bring to a job. Human capital is also the investment made by a corporation, business, or agency that hires

an individual to do a certain job. In looking at how we prepare teachers for the classroom via teacher certification programs, using human capital theory as a lens through which to judge teacher quality is a useful research tool. Schools represent the quintessential knowledge industry, and as such, teachers are the archetypal knowledge workers. Using human capital theory to compare teachers, based on certification type, is a basic input and output argument.

In his analysis of investments in human capital, Becker (1993) argued that "education and training are the most important investments in human capital" (p. 17). That is the personal side of human capital: invest in your own education and training and you will get a better job and earn more. However, Becker (1993) pointed out that there is another side to human capital, which involves employers seeking to invest in human capital. What employers required are not college transcripts and grade reports, but an ability for employees to perform the duties they were hired to carry out (Becker, 1993). According to Becker (1993), job changes are more common among unskilled workers and less common among skilled workers. The reason this particular statement stands out is that it related to the hiring of newly certified teachers. Ingersoll (2003) found that, 14% of new teachers leave by the end of their first year, 33% leave within three years, and almost 50% leave in five years. Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) cited that among alternatively certified teachers in Los Angeles, only 80 percent completed their first year of on the job teacher training, and that only 65 completed the second year of training required to receive a valid teaching certificate. To emphasize that this was not just a Los Angeles, or a California problem, Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) reported high attrition rates among alternative teacher certification teacher candidates in Dallas, where only 54 percent of the alternative certification candidates made it through the first year, and only 40 percent stayed in

teaching past the second year. Similar results were found in and New York, where in *the first year* 15% left the program by Thanksgiving, and 30%of the remainder leaving at the end of the first year (Youngs, 2002). According to Blaug (1976), the key concept of human capital theory was that people spend on themselves in diverse ways, not for the sake of present enjoyments, but for the sake of future pecuniary and non-pecuniary returns. If that held true, then those seeking to become highly qualified teachers through traditional certification programs made greater investments in time and money in order to become qualified educators, while those who sought certification through alternative routes invested relatively less.

In applying human capital theory to teachers and teacher certification, two different variables were considered: the human capital investment made by the teacher and the human capital investment made by the states that oversee teacher certification programs and school districts that hire teachers. Teachers are a human capital investment. In looking at the types of programs, and the academic literature/research applied to each, it was clear that both sides of the argument felt strongly about the programs that they support. Traditional certification programs saw themselves as the gold standard in teacher certification in that they had a mix of relevant coursework, student teaching and other teacher supports that guaranteed that graduates from their programs were high quality teachers. On the other side of the coin, alternative certification programs have argued that their methods for training candidates to become highly qualified teachers were the same thing as, or perhaps better than traditional certification programs in that they got their candidates out into the field faster and were better at addressing the teacher shortages that our public schools faced.

According to McConney, Price, and Woods-McConney (2012) one of the chief concerns with this *fast tracking* of teacher candidates to address the shortage of teachers was that there was a growing body of research which showed that attrition rates were higher for alternatively certified teachers in their first years of teaching, and that the overall impression was being formed that alternatively certified teachers did not stay in teaching long further exacerbating the revolving door issue leading to a shortage of qualified teachers (McConney, Price, & Woods-McConney, 2012, p. vii). Darling-Hammond (2000) in an analysis of teacher qualifications and student achievement concluded that states which struggled to meet demands for teachers have turned to alternative teacher certification candidates in order to ensure that classrooms were staffed. Darling Hammond (2000) argued that one of the major problems with reducing the preparation and training time to become a teacher was that it invited a candidate with only a few weeks of training to teach, in what would most likely be a challenging classroom. Casey, Dunlap, Brister, and Davidson (2011) conducted a study looking at the experiences of novice, alternatively certified teachers in Texas. They found that the 52 teachers that they surveyed, 75% responded that they had problems understanding the curriculum and knowing what to teach. Of the same group 55% cited classroom management as their chief concern. This aligns with Hess (2002) who argued the following point:

> Rejecting knowledge-based and skill-based criteria, certification as currently practiced emphasizes various hard-to-judge personal qualities. Such a model is the norm in professions like marketing, journalism, consulting, or policymaking, where a subtle blend of people skills and relevant expertise is required. In professions like these, where there are a number of ways for practitioners to excel but where it is difficult to know in

> advance how any particular practitioner will perform, the most sensible way to find talent is to allow aspirants to seek work and to permit employers to screen them on a variety of criteria—such as education, experience, and references. (p. 173)

Teacher Certification

As was stated earlier, one of the main provisions of the No Child Left Beind Act of 2001 mandated that every classroom be staffed by a highly qualified teacher. This meant that every teacher had to hold some level of state certification in order to teach any subject. What will follow is a review of the literature surrounding the area of teacher certification and the routes that a prospective teacher must take in order to become a highly qualified teacher, and the various roles that teacher certification programs play in ensuring teacher quality. Hess (2002) argued that America needed better teachers. The mounting empirical evidence of the importance of teacher quality has generated a dialogue about the quality of our nation's teaching force. Yet, the problem persisted that the students who needed the most capable, highest quality teachers were those most likely to be harmed by the deficit of high quality teachers. This dual quality-quantity impasse required new thinking in our approach to training and certifying prospective teachers. (p. 169).

In a 2009 policy brief for the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, Darling-Hammond reported that in four well-controlled longitudinal studies, using individual-level student data from Houston, Texas, New York City, and North Carolina, it was found that teachers who began teaching before completing preparation—on temporary/emergency permits or as alternative route candidates—were less effective than fully prepared or traditionally prepared beginning teachers working with similar students in their initial year or two on the job

(p.2). Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy (2001) in regards to student teacher training in classroom management asserted that more studies were needed that related to specific parts of teachers' preparation (content areas, pedagogical training, student teaching) to the effects on their teaching practice, and possibly on student achievement. Studies that compared the relative importance of individual parts of teacher preparation would be useful to those designing and revising teacher education programs (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001, p. iv).

The data used in this policy brief provided a compelling argument that alternatively certified teachers are not as effective as those with traditional certification. However, there was research conducted by Ballou and Podgursky (1998), Goldhaber & Anthony(2007), Greenberg, Walsh, & McKee (2014), Walsh (2001), and Walsh & Podgursky (2001) which refuted these claims. The public and academic debates about traditional and alternative teacher certification usually centered on one of two positions: traditional university-based teacher education programs that led to licensure and advocacy for strict regulation of entrants to teaching and their preparation, and a market-based, or antiregulatory approach that favored alternative teacher certification programs. Those who had advocated for more regulations proposed higher standards of entry, extensive classwork, and student teacher preparation, as well as promoting professional standards as mechanisms for improving teacher quality and status of the teaching profession. The proponents of a market-based approach to teacher certification argued that regulations served as barriers to entry for those who wanted to teach, and that increased regulations had proven ineffective as quality control mechanisms. Advocates for alternative approaches to teacher certification and licensure believed that a greater reliance on market forces would, over time, improve the quality of the field of teaching. Henry (2014) concluded that in

the end, "we still know very little about the effectiveness of teachers based on the preparation they have received before beginning to teach" (p. 7).

Goodwin, Smith, Souto-Manning, Cheruvu, Tan, Reed, and Taveras (2014) affirmed that sound reasoning tells us that quality teacher education relies on quality teacher educators and quality teacher education programs. Yet, there is minimal attention given to what teacher educators should know and what they should be able to do. No one doubts the validity of the statement that, teacher educators cannot teach what they do not know; but what is not fully understood is what *should* they know, and *how* should they be prepared? What do current teacher certification programs teacher educators consider to be the keystone elements of their profession? How do they assess their own training in these areas? How do their experiences inform the education of t student teachers (p. 284)? What follows is a presentation of literature on traditional and alternative certification respectively.

Traditional Teacher Certification. Traditionally certified teachers can be loosely defined as teachers who have been licensed to teach after having completed a teacher education program at a recognized college or university. These programs expect a significant degree of commitment from prospective teachers (degree completion), which includes regular attendance of classes, and some form of student teaching or internship program. For example, the basic requirements a teacher candidate must meet to fulfill the teacher certification requirements in the University of Texas at Austin's (2014) teacher certification program include a degree in their primary teaching field/content area, meeting all of the requirements for the appropriate major,

and completing core courses in the major that fulfills certification requirements. This core includes 24 semester hours in a single teaching field and 48 semester hours in a composite teaching field, both of which incorporate the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) needed for successful teaching in the field ("Steps to Certification," n.d.).

Other state universities, such as the University of Houston, Texas State University, the University of Texas San Antonio, Prairie View A&M, and Huston Tillotson University, had similar teacher education programs consisting of general teacher education *pre-teaching* coursework, student teaching, and preparing for an taking the required TExES exams. Each of these programs was a traditional four-year program that led to a Bachelor's degree and teacher certification. Levine's (2006) study on teacher education programs indicated that exemplary teacher education programs were committed to preparing excellent teachers, and that had clearly defined what excellent teachers need to know and be able to do in a classroom. These exemplary programs also included well-supervised and extensive field experience components. Each of the university-based programs listed above had language in their various college of education teacher certification program language similar to Levine's (2006). This underscores that traditional teacher certification programs have academically rigorous programs that have clearly defined support mechanisms and high expectations for their student teachers. Those who have pushed for traditional teacher certification and increased regulations were primarily concerned about the professionalizing of teaching and improving the quality of teachers in our public schools. Their arguments have centered on improving teacher quality by increasing standards of accreditation and certification that they are certain will promote an improved teaching profession that is more appealing to candidates seeking to make teaching their career. Supporters of

traditional teacher certification have proposed that if entry standards to the profession were raised, the quality of the teacher force would improve, which would in turn raise the public's regard for the profession, and force policymakers to raise teacher salaries and promote higher status for the profession (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Klein, 1999).

Proponents of traditional teacher certification argue that alternative routes to teacher certification tend to be insufficient in their goal of adequately preparing and certifying teachers. For instance, Darling-Hammond (2000) found that alternatively certified teacher candidates tended to be less satisfied with their training and had greater difficulties planning curriculum, teaching, managing the classroom, and diagnosing students' learning needs—all skills that they must master if they were to be effective teachers. She concluded by stating that "they [alternatively certified teachers] are less able to adapt their instruction to promote student learning and less likely to see it as their job to do so, blaming students if their teaching is not effective" (Darling-Hammond, 2000, p. 167). Yet, as No Child Left Behind unfolded across the educational landscape, supporters of alternative teacher certification became more vocal in their support of alternative certification, despite a growing amount research that challenged their assertions.

Alternative Teacher Certification. Dr. Rod Paige (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), former Secretary of Education under President George W. Bush, argued that here was little evidence that education school course work leads to improved student achievement. He ended his remarks by affirming that teachers should be hired based on subject content matter knowledge and verbal ability alone. Attending an education school, he determined, should be optional and the states should eliminate student teaching requirements and other burdensome

bureaucratic hurdles (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 41). To better understand alternative teacher certification, it was necessary to look into the characteristics that defined it and what it looked like in the field.

Alternative Teacher Certification Programs (ATCPs) have been a topic of contention where teacher quality was concerned. One of the most common arguments concerning ATCPs is that there are so many of them, of such a variety, that it is hard to quantify them in regards to student achievement, or teacher quality. Martin and Shoho (1999) concluded that alternative certification programs are typically defined in one of three main ways: 1) graduate study in education, 2) a small amount of professional teacher education before classroom teaching, or 3) commencement of teaching without teacher education. Scribner and Heine (2009) pointed out that alternative certification programs typically consist of programs and trainings that address the professional preparation needs of candidates who have completed a bachelor's degree and who have considerable professional experience outside of teaching who want to become teachers (p. 179).

In a multi-state study, Feistritzer and Chester (2003) reported a total of 144 routes other than the traditional college teacher education program to attain certification (Feistritzer & Chester, 2003). As a result, researchers and policy makers were not only looking for studies that rigorously evaluated how traditionally certified teachers compared to alternatively certified teachers, but they were also keenly interested in research that compared alternative teacher certification programs to each other. Proponents of alternative certification argued that alternative routes to certification helped fill positions in schools and districts experiencing teacher shortages, as well as opening up the field to candidates that may have been starting a new

career. Advocates of alternative certification policies often argued that by opening teaching to experienced entrants from other professions it would boost the quality of the pool of potential teachers. They contended that these alternative certification programs would attract qualified candidates who brought both a broad worldview and experience with children, which candidates who entered teaching immediately after college may not have possessed (Johnson, Birkeland, Peske, & Munger, 2005, p. 10).

In support of alternative certification programs, some have argued that good teaching was really about understanding subject area content, as well as an eagerness to teach. Thus, according to supporters of alternative certification, teaching positions should be made available to those *qualified* individuals who showed competency in their content area knowledge and were interested in teaching, but lacked the credentials or coursework necessary under the traditional certification system (Kearns, 1990; Kerr, 1983; Kramer, 1991). It has also been pointed out that alternatively certified teachers were generally older, more likely be considered a minority, and were more likely to have been employed in other fields than the traditionally certified teacher population (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Consequently, the teaching field would be diversified through allowing alternatively certified candidates to enter the profession. The final argument that proponents of alternative teacher certification had was that the traditional, university-based teacher education programs had monopolized the field of teacher certification; therefore, a common sense, free-market approach to improve teacher education and certification would be to introduce competition into this area (Shen, 1997). In response to the competition, many university-based colleges of education began offering alternative, post- baccalaureate teacher certification.

Education researchers Stoddart and Floden (1995) maintained that there were three assumptions underlying alternative certification policy: 1) If one knows a subject, one can teach it; 2) One learns to teach by doing it; 3) Mature individuals with prior work experience make better teachers, and expand and diversify the teaching pool. To underscore this, Fraser (2001) argued that the public had lost confidence in the traditional teacher certification programs. He concluded his discussion by noting that increased state testing of teachers had resulted in "appalling" results, which have in turn had caused the public to lose faith in teachers' abilities to help students achieve educational goals (p. 57). Fraser proposed decoupling basic teacher education from teacher licensure and certification. He also recommended that those in government should have removed themselves from the business of regulating teacher-preparation programs by stating that we, the general public, should let schools hire whom they wished to hire, and certify those they would prefer to become teachers. Our role as teacher educators should be to provide programs with such well-defined value that the districts would hire our graduates in preference to other candidates (Fraser, 2001).)

Fraser (2001) proposed that teacher education should be opened up to a more market-based approach, based on the assumption that if they succeed in preparing high quality teachers, the result will be that states and school districts will naturally seek out these alternatively certified teachers who are, according to NCLB (2001), highly qualified. In return, Fraser (2001) suggested that the states give up any claim to regulate the various alternative certification program curricula. He ended by stating, "Let higher education prepare the best possible teachers, according to its own judgments. And let schools hire the best teachers, according to their best judgments. Both, I believe, will thrive on their newfound freedom" (Fraser, 2001,

p. 4). An observation that was made during the course of this study was that so many teachers, of both certification types, were finding jobs in schools, only to leave relatively early on in their careers creating a revolving door effect whereby schools had no choice but to keep hiring inexperienced new teacher, hoping that they would eventually find the teachers they needed. It was found by Ingersoll (2013) that within five years, between 40 and 50 percent of all beginning teachers have left the profession (p. 2). He concluded by stating that the data on new teacher attrition suggested that efforts to recruit more teachers—which had been the focus of much policy—would not, by themselves, solve the staffing problems plaguing schools (Ingersoll, 2013, p. 3). The conclusion being that it was not clear that competition had improved education, that it had only flooded the market with inexperienced teachers.

In her seminal report on teacher certification quality, Walsh (2001) asked the question: "Does research exist proving that certified teachers produce greater student achievement than do uncertified teachers?" This report was included in this literature review because of its significance within the literature that supports alternative teacher certification. The Walsh report (2001) is often cited in research that compares teacher certification types and research supporting alternative teacher certification. Her assertion was that there was insufficient evidence to prove that there was a difference between the two types of teachers. To start off she argued against the claim by the traditional teacher education establishment that "taking the coursework needed to obtain certification is not only the best, but also the only acceptable means for preparing teachers" (Walsh, 2001, p. iii). To emphasize just how deficient the evidence in favor of traditional teacher certification was, she produced a list of related deficiencies that characterized the work of those whose research supported traditional teacher certification. At the top of her list

was research that was seen as helping the case for certification which she felt was cited selectively, while research that was not was overlooked. She continued by stating that the lack of evidence for certification was concealed by the practice of filling analyses with multiple references that seemed to provide support, but once read, did not. Walsh further argued that research was cited that was too old to be reliable adding that; research that had not been subjected to peer-review was given unmerited weight, with a particular reliance on unpublished dissertations. She pointed out that instead of using standardized measures of student achievement, advocates for traditional teacher certification programs designed their own assessment measures in order to prove certification's value. Her concern in this area was that basic principles of reliable statistical analysis, which were common in other academic disciplines, were consistently violated; examples included failing to control for key variables such as poverty and previous student achievement, and using small sample sizes which did not allow generalization or reliable statistical inference (Walsh, 2001, p. 16).

To support her assertions Walsh (2001) used several studies, the first of which was a 1996 study conducted by Greenwald, Hedges, and Laine, which studied teacher attributes such as verbal ability, experience, and Master's degrees (see Table 1).

Table 1

Number of Studies and their Correlation to Student Achievement

Teacher Attribute	Positive And Significant	Positive But Insignificant	Negative and Significant	Negative But Insignificant
Verbal Ability	12	9	1	2
Experience	20	2	28	18
Master's Degrees	7	6	16	16

Greenwald, Hedges, and Laine (1996): Breakout of Studies on Teacher Attributes. Appeared in Walsh, K. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore,MD: The Abell Foundation.

Walsh's overview of the study concluded that "of the three teacher attributes examined by Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, the evidence supporting the value of a master's degree for improving student achievement is only marginal" (p. 18). She went on in her report to cite further research that she found questionable, mostly that of researcher Darling-Hammond. Walsh's research into Darling-Hammond focused on the increasing amount of coursework that traditionally certified teachers undertook to get certified, and how that made no difference in teacher quality. Walsh (2001) concluded her argument by stating that:

> Reduced to its essence, teacher certification was incapable of providing any insight into an individual's ability, intellectual curiosity, creativity, affinity for children, and instructional skills. So long as the deficiencies in the research on teacher quality are ignored, misrepresented, or debated, there are clear losers. They are the disadvantaged students who are most dependent upon the quality of their teachers and the opportunity provided by a high quality public school education. (p. 41)

Among the chief critics of the report was Darling-Hammond; and Walsh held little back in what became a highly publicized debate on teacher certification. Additional opponents of traditional teacher certification programs have argued that the more formal, university-based

programs with pedagogy-based curricula required too much of the teacher candidate's time, by requiring courses that many felt were unnecessary. The focus, they argued, should be on experience, ability to communicate, common professional sense, content knowledge, and natural talent for teaching (Ballou & Podgursky, 1998; Walsh, 2001). In a 2009 report for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), various types of alternative certification programs were compared to traditional certification programs. The report found that high-coursework traditional certification teachers (N=40) were required to complete consisted of 144 credit hours course work and student teaching, compared with 60 hours of coursework and student teaching or internships required of alternative certification teachers (N=46). Comparison of student test scores on reading and math yielded little or no statistical difference between the two groups (p. xvii).

What stood out in the IES study (2009) were the types of coursework undertaken by each in regards to classroom management and pedagogical practices--important factors that figure heavily in this study. The IES study (2009) compared the specific course work undertaken by four cohorts: high-coursework alternative certification teachers, low coursework alternative certification teachers, high coursework traditional certification teachers, and low coursework alternative certification teachers. In regards to classroom management, the high coursework alternative certified teachers took 49 hours of classroom management classes compared to 39 hours undertaken by their high coursework traditionally certified counterparts. The low coursework alternative certification teacher, however, only took twenty 44 of classroom management classes in comparison to 54 hours undertaken by their low coursework traditional

certification counterparts. Table 2 shows the amount of pedagogical coursework undertaken by each group.

Table 2

Average Hours of Instruction by Content Area, AC and TC Teachers

	Reading/Language Arts Pedagogy	Math Pedagogy
Low Coursework AC Teachers	26	9
Low Coursework TC Teachers	121	41
High Coursework AC Teachers	102	43
High Coursework TC Teachers	109	41

Table appears in Institute of Education Sciences. (2009). An evaluation of teachers trained through different routes to certification: Final report (NCEE 2009-4043). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education (p. 40).

With any argument there are always two sides. Both sides of the traditional certification versus the alternative certification argument claimed that they better prepared teachers, and there was a sufficient amount of literature that supported these arguments. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation 2013 report cited that of all of the teacher certification/preparation programs that they observed, 51% of all educator preparation providers, and 41% of the institutions of higher education were not accredited through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), a widely respected organization that accredits and reviews all types of educator preparation programs.

One of the major issues surrounding teacher quality was a teacher's years of experience, as well as their type of certification. What has made this particularly problematic for supporters of both types of teacher certification was the significantly high attrition rate among teachers with five years or less teaching experience. A study by the New Teacher Project (2012) speculated

that the teaching profession was failing to identify and or keep those teachers with greatest potential to improve teaching and learning. What they did not cover was where these *irreplaceables*, or super teachers, would come from. They only stipulated that we needed more great teachers, and that we should get rid of the bad teachers in our schools. In other words, they were very good at framing the problem and placing the blame on the system and the bad teachers that the system supports, with virtually no solutions offered other than we should work harder to keep the good teachers. Liston, Borko, and Whitcomb (2008) stipulated that, where teachers were concerned, there was a revolving door that many new teachers went through. It was reported that within the first five years, a significant number of teachers either left teaching altogether or once they are able to, moved from high-poverty schools to schools that served more upper-class communities. Liston, et al. (2008) argued that significant reforms in new teacher preparation applied in the 90s (like alternative teacher certification programs) may not have been adequate to assist new teachers in managing the ups and downs of the first year of teaching if they had the misfortune of starting their careers in schools with tougher working conditions (p. 114).

Much of the emphasis of the good teacher-bad teacher debate had focused mainly on student achievement-based on test scores. How a teacher was prepared to become the highly qualified individual that would raise student test scores, especially where underserved populations were concerned, was still a source of debate. What was found to be lacking in the literature was how both alternative and traditional teacher preparation programs lacked a focus on creating teachers who felt that they could manage classrooms and handle student discipline. There was no shortage of literature on the harmful effects of student disciplinary actions used by

teachers as a way to maintain order in their classrooms. An additional and troubling finding was that the disciplinary actions taken by teachers were disproportionately being used against students of color, especially boys. It was emphasized that such disciplinary actions had been shown to have detrimental effects on the academic futures of the students who were the targets of these actions.

Summary

The literature that was used to develop this review was revealing in that it explored how traditionally certified and alternatively certified teachers were prepared to become classroom mangers and student disciplinarians. It also identified a possible link between their lack of preparation and the over-disciplining of students. While there was enough literature on traditionally certified teachers to help define them and understand the training that goes into preparing them, it would have been helpful had there been more definitive studies conducted as to how traditionally certified teachers compared to their alternatively certified peers where teacher quality was concerned. On the other hand, there was no shortage of literature and studies conducted by pro-alternative certification people or groups with similar ideologies who argued in defense of alternatively certified teachers. These, however, tended to focus on value-added models, based solely on test scores, which did not provide enough information to make a reliable assessment in regards to teacher quality as it was related to type of teacher certification.

The present study will add to the existing literature on teacher certification and teacher quality. Stepping away from the more traditional, test result-based, or value-added models of teacher certification studies, it focused on classroom management and discipline beliefs and

practices of teachers new to the profession. It is a unique study in that it focused on teachers new to the profession in suburban and urban middle schools which served a majority of poor, at-risk students instead of solely focusing on urban environments which have been the traditional focal points of this type of research. By studying the disciplinary practices and beliefs of the two groups, traditionally and alternatively certified teachers, it was hypothesized that a measurable difference might be found in the ways in which they managed their classrooms and handled student discipline.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction: Design and Overview of Study

This dissertation examined how teachers from different educational certification programs viewed their preparation for handling classroom management and student discipline by analyzing their answers to a take-home survey instrument and the severity ratings results to student scenario videos that they watched. The survey instrument asked basic demographic questions about age, gender, grades taught, subject(s) taught, and how long they had been a teacher. The videos consisted of six scenarios depicting students committing discretionary offenses. After viewing each scenario, the teacher indicated how they would rate the infraction on a Likert scale, and what course of disciplinary action, if any, they would take in that situation. It built upon the literature surrounding teacher quality and certification type in that it focused on the classroom management beliefs and practices of early career middle school teachers, an area that in need of more in-depth research.

According to Emmer and Stough (2001), classroom management research had implications for a number of educational policy matters, such as teacher certification testing and professional evaluations, professional development, school reform, and how the public perceived schools. Knowledge of this body of scholarship added to an educational psychologists' ability to contribute to school policy in these matters (Emmer and Stough, 2001, p. 106).

Both quantitative and survey research methods were used in researching this issue. Six urban and suburban middle schools in central Texas were chosen, where data were collected

from 30 participating teachers who answered take-home survey questions and participated in a face-to-face meeting in their classroom. In this setting, teachers viewed the video segments of students involved in various disciplinary situations, which required them to make decisions as to the severity of the infraction by rating each of them on a one to five-point Likert scale.

Putman (2009) stated that "one of the biggest concerns of beginning teachers is the lack of preparation they receive in classroom management." This perceived lack of knowledge, he concluded, caused these teachers to doubt their abilities to effectively handle disruptions in the classroom (Putman, 2009). The aim of this dissertation study was to discern whether there is a difference in the way alternatively certified and traditionally certified early career teachers handled classroom management decisions where student discipline was concerned. The recorded teacher factors included the teacher's years of experience, their gender, their ethnicity, and the type of certification program they attended to become an accredited teacher. The study measured how teachers new to the profession handled classroom management and student discipline issues, and analyzed the data to see if there was a significant difference between the two groups (traditional and alternative certification) in regards to the way they responded to both the written survey questions and their responses to the video segments. Rather than taking one side or the other in the current debate on teacher certification routes as it related to teacher quality, the goal was to see if there were gaps in teacher preparation in the areas of classroom management and student discipline. The research questions that framed the research were as follows:

1. What are the differences, if any, between the way traditionally certified and alternatively certified middle school teachers who are new to the profession handle classroom management and discipline?

2. How do teachers who are new to the profession (one to five years of experience) view their preparedness to manage their classrooms and their ability to deal with student disciplinary issues?

These questions formed a framework around which this study was built. This study sought to ascertain whether or not a pattern existed in the way certain types of certified teachers perceived and handled disciplinary infractions as they were simulated in a simulated classroom setting. The information that was generated by this research will be used to study current teacher certification practices and to change the ways in which we prepare future teachers to effectively handle their classrooms and meet the unique and changing needs of their increasingly diverse students.

The Districts

The teachers that participated in this study came from four districts in central Texas. The districts were chosen for their location and their demographics. The location was an important factor because these districts closely resemble other urban and suburban school districts around the state of Texas. Furthermore, these districts were demographically similar. Additionally, these districts characterize what school districts are beginning to look like around the country. The districts that were chosen serve diverse student populations consisting of large numbers of at-risk and economically disadvantaged students. Tables 3-6 represent the various district demographics.

Table 3

District I Demographics

Total Number of Students	22, 576
White Students	4, 011 (18%)
African American Students	5, 409 (24%)
Latino Students	11, 922 (53%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	1, 821 (8%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	14, 091 (62%)
At-Risk Students	12, 590 (56%)

Table 4

District II Demographics

Total Number of Students	11, 317
White Students	674 (6%)
African American Students	1, 122 (10%)
Latino Students	9, 295 (82%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	3, 781 (33%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	10, 018 (88.5%)
At-Risk Students	7, 451 (66%)

Table 5

District III Demographics

Total Number of Students	86, 233
White Students	21, 396 (25%)
African American Students	7, 485 (9%)
Latino Students	52, 077 (60%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	23, 650 (27%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54, 313 (60%)
At-Risk Students	45, 968 (53%)

Table 6

District IV Demographics

Total Number of Students	45, 588
White Students	20, 081 (44%)
African American Students	4, 114 (9%)
Latino Students	13, 774 (30%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	3, 789 (8%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	13, 601 (30%)
At-Risk Students	11, 680 (26%)

The Schools

The schools chosen for this study were initially selected because of their location and their demographics. These were important variables in that these schools served large numbers of minority, at-risk, and economically disadvantaged students that statistics drawn from five years of data collected by the Texas Education Agency's Academic Excellence Indicator System (2014) have shown to be overrepresented in school discipline statistics. The six middle schools that were used in the study were selected because of the willingness of their principals to provide access to their teachers. One middle school was chosen from District I (school A), one middle school (school B) was chosen from District II, two middles schools (schools C and D) were chosen from District III, and lastly, two middle schools (schools E and F) were chosen from District IV. Middle schools were chosen because a growing number of studies have shown that these are the grades where students begin to manifest behaviors that will inhibit their academic progress or guide them through high school and beyond (Juvonen, Le, Kaganoff, Augustine, & Constant, 2004). Tables 7-12 represent each participating school's demographics.

Table 7

School A Demographics

Total Number of Students	887
White Students	99 (11%)
African American Students	301 (34%)
Latino Students	451 (51%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	51 (6%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	626 (71%)
At-Risk Students	377 (42.5%)

Table 8

School B Demographics

Total Number of Students	856
White Students	67 (8%)
African American Students	72 (8%)
Latino Students	686 (80%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	163 (19%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	732 (85.5%)
At-Risk Students	486 (57%)

Table 9

School C Demographics

Total Number of Students	1, 156
White Students	473 (41%)
African American Students	155 (13%)
Latino Students	366 (32%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	63 (5%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	431 (37%)
At-Risk Students	256 (22%)

Table 10

School D Demographics

Total Number of Students	1, 136
White Students	718 (63%)
African American Students	26 (2%)
Latino Students	286 (25%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	20 (2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	85 (7.5%)
At-Risk Students	150 (13%)

Table 11

School E Demographics

Total Number of Students	878
White Students	318 (36%)
African American Students	134 (15%)
Latino Students	352 (40%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	40 (5%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	332 (38%)
At-Risk Students	213 (24%)

Table 12

School F Demographics

Total Number of Students	861
White Students	233 (27%)
African American Students	144 (17%)
Latino Students	411 (48%)
English Language Learners (ELL)	70 (8%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students	527 (61%)
At-Risk Students	249 (29%)

Procedure

The procedure used in this study involved mixed-methods, including teacher surveys, and a face-to-face meeting where teachers viewed and rated videos of students breaking discretionary rules in class on a Likert scale. To answer the research questions, the data collected in the

surveys and video scenario ratings were used to measure any differences between the two groups of teachers. It was theorized that in collecting and analyzing this data, a measurable difference would be observed between the two groups of early career teachers by comparing the answers that they gave on the survey and their reactions to the scenarios played out in the video scenarios. The reason these methods were chosen was that they revealed not only how prepared teachers felt about being effective classroom mangers, but also provided a window into how teachers would actually handle student discipline issues in scenarios that depicted students committing minor infractions which required the teachers to make quick discretionary decisions about how to discipline the offending students. The use of video scenarios also revealed any potential racial bias that teachers had in regards to how they handled classroom management and student discipline issues, in that the video scenarios included African-American, Latino, and White males and females.

The teachers who took part in the study were all volunteers who agreed to participate after being contacted by their principals. An invitation to participate in the study was sent to each principal, outlining who was needed (early career teachers with one to five years of teaching experience), and what was required of them (a take-home survey about their teacher preparation and their experiences as teachers, as well as an in person session where they would view and rate video scenarios of students misbehaving in class). Each teacher responded by direct contact to set up dates and times when they would be available to turn in the survey, watch the video scenarios, and grade their severity, as well as indicating the actions that they would have taken on a Likert scale. It was not known at the onset of the study how many teachers of each certification type would make up the sample. After the teachers agreed to participate, they

were separated into certification types. Of the teachers who volunteered (N=30), 18 were alternatively certified teachers and 12 were traditionally–small sample, but one that fulfilled the needs of the study. According to Onwuegbuzie and Collins (2007), sampling decisions usually are more complicated in mixed methods research because sampling schemes must be designed for both the survey and quantitative research sections of the study. They concluded that it is appropriate to uses small samples in quantitative studies that are exploratory in nature (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007).

Survey Questions

The participating teachers were asked in the initial, face-to-face meeting to fill out and return a take-home survey (Appendix A) that consisted of demographic questions and other questions related to their teacher certification training and experiences as early career teachers. One of the key factors in getting honest answers to the survey questions was in positioning myself with the participant teachers as a former teacher, rather than a doctoral student working on a study. Cousin (2010) reasoned that "research encounters vary enormously, and social positionality is one element among many that shape them" (p. 14). In taking the position as a former educator who had taught in schools similar to theirs, it was easier to talk to the participants about teacher education, certification programs, and the challenges that they as early career teachers had faced. In her research Hurst (2008) gained the confidence of her participants in that she shared common experiences upon which she could draw to empathize with her participants. She argued that her insider status as a member of the same class with a similar background and experiences encouraged authentic responses from her participants. Hurst (2008) intuitively understood that respondents tended to be concerned that some facts, descriptions, and

stories might reinforce negative stereotypes about their class; or in the case of this study, their status and reputations as early career teachers, and that it mattered greatly that the researcher could see things from their point of view. Hurst (2008) contended that "this shared terrain is thought to increase respondent trust and disclosure" (p. 340), and concluded by stating that "it matters a great deal who the researcher is in relation to those being interviewed" (p. 342). The first questions on the survey document (Appendix A) focused on age, sex, and ethnicity. The questions that followed centered on the individual teacher's certification program, time in the classroom, and challenges that they have faced in the classroom as a novice teacher. When the surveys were completed, they were transcribed and coded. The coding process involved breaking the responses to the surveys down into two major categories based on certification type. The responses were then further analyzed for similarities and differences.

Video Scenarios, Ratings, and Questions

The six video scenarios that each teacher viewed and rated were taken from a list of discretionary offenses listed in the participating central Texas district's and school's student codes of conduct. In using discretionary items, it was possible to see how teachers made quick disciplinary decisions in each case. Of the original list of ten discretionary offenses (Appendix B), six were chosen. These six represented offenses which were most likely to be encountered in the classroom on a regular basis (Mendez & Knoff, 2003, p. 39). The focus on discretionary offenses was important in that "other studies demonstrate, the vast majority of suspensions are for minor infractions of school rules, such as disrupting class, tardiness, and dress code violations, rather than for serious violent or criminal behavior" (Losen & Martinez, 2013, p. 1).

The viewing and rating of the video scenarios took place in private person-to-person meetings in each teacher's classroom. The classrooms were used to give the teachers a sense of comfort so that they would respond to the video scenarios in a more natural manner. In addition to choosing a neutral location, by positioning myself as a former middle school teacher and someone familiar with the role of the teacher and how classrooms worked, it was easier to get the teachers to relax and talk openly about what they saw and how they would react were the scenes in the video scenarios to take place in their actual classrooms.

Discretionary and Non-Discretionary Referrals

The district Student Codes of Conduct were used to generate the list of discretionary referrals (Appendix B) used in this study. It is worth noting that in two of the districts, there were three schools that had their own student codes of conduct that were campus-specific. In reviewing all of them, each had similar distinctions as to what constituted a discretionary referral and what constituted a non-discretionary referral. What could be constituted as a discretionary offense was often unclear, labelled ambiguously as "student misconduct" and open to interpretation by teachers. This was problematic in that studies have shown that students who have broken rules of a discretionary nature have been punished similarly to students who have violated codes of a non-discretionary nature, in that they have been written referrals and removed from the classroom, often being suspended from school. According to Texas Appleseed (2007), "many school districts are using their discretion under state law to suspend or refer students to DAEPs for a range of student Code of Conduction violations—including disrupting class, talking back to a teacher, or using profanity" (p. 25). Non-discretionary referrals, as stipulated by the Texas Education Code, Chapter 37, are the following:

1) committing a felony or engaging in conduct punishable as a felony; 2) injuring another person during an assault; 3) selling, giving, possessing, or being under the influence of a dangerous drug or alcohol; and 4) committing an offense that involves volatile chemicals, public lewdness, or retaliation against a school employee.19" (Texas Appleseed, 2007, p. 19).

Video Scenarios

Using the research of Brophy and McCaslin (1992), Huebner (1995), and Emmer and Stough (2010), it was determined that the best way to conduct this research was to use video scenarios of students breaking discretionary rules to gauge teachers' reactions. Each of these scholars used some form of scenarios or vignettes to investigate issues surrounding teachers and teaching. The video scenarios used in this study included six students, three males and three females, from three ethnic groups; African-American, Latino, and White. Each student acted in all six scenarios. This was done was to establish from the teacher responses whether or not the teachers made different disciplinary decisions based on the student's race or sex. Seeing how teachers made these decisions was important in that how the individual teacher reacted to each scenario. Of equal value was the disciplinary decision they would make in regards to the scenarios they viewed. It was determined that this would provide valuable insight into their training and classroom practices—practices that in real-life situations could have a harmful impact on a student's future. As stated by Fowler (2007), too many disciplinary referrals of any type have been shown to have a negative impact on a student's academic future, as well as the ways in which the students viewed themselves, their teachers, the school, and education as a whole. Removing students from mainstream programs through disciplinary referrals has been

shown to have a negative effect on their academic achievement. Many students return to their home campuses from DAEPs or Juvenile Justice Educational facilities with little or no academic improvement. As a result, those students who are continually suspended from school may lose academic skills as a result of lost instruction time in a regular classroom setting (Fowler, 2007, p. 30).

These scenarios were chosen because they depicted disciplinary situations that were considered minor offenses of a discretionary nature. Each represented a direct challenge to the teacher's authority. A) The first discretionary offense involved two students talking to each other about a subject unrelated to the lecture being given by the teacher. The teacher interrupted them, asked them to get back on task, and they went right back to talking to each other. B) The second scenario involved a student using a smart phone and being told to put it away. The student heard the teacher's request and continued to use the device after being told to put it away. C) Talking back to the teacher or verbally challenging a teacher's authority occurred in the next scenario. This scenario involves an outburst by the student related to the content being presented by the teacher. The student in the scenario challenged the teacher about why what was being taught was of any importance or relevance. D) Another scenario involved a student who interacted with another student inappropriately by arguing with that student during a teacher-led discussion and continued to argue after being told to stop by the teacher. E) A scenario was shot that showed a student who arrived late to class and reacted negatively to the teacher when asked why they were tardy. F) Lastly, there was a scenario which involved a student who did not agree with a teacher's decision, specifically a grade on test that was handed back during class, and acted out their disapproval.

Teachers have often been confronted by the offenses which were depicted in these scenarios. The items selected for this study in particular were chosen because of the subjective nature of the offenses and the likelihood that they would reveal a teacher's training in classroom management, or their relative impartiality in dealing with minor offenses which often occur on a daily basis. Due to the frequent occurrence of these particular infractions in many classrooms, it was interesting seeing how each teacher made disciplinary decisions in each of the scenarios presented. The way each teacher reacted to these events was usually subjective, rather than objective, so the scenario tests generated interesting results. How each teacher handled these situations revealed how they managed their classrooms and handled such infractions, providing insight into how they teachers viewed themselves as classroom mangers and disciplinarians. After viewing each scenario, teachers were then asked to rate the severity of the infraction depicted in the scenario on a one to five Likert scale and verbally indicate why they chose that particular rating rating. The scale was set up in the following fashion: A score of 1 meant that the teacher had no reaction to the scenario, and therefore would not take any action in a real life situation similar to the one depicted in the video scenario. A score of 2 indicated that the teacher would have issued a verbal warning to the student, were the offense in the video scenario to take place in their classroom. A score of 3 meant that the teacher would take action to address the situation depicted in the video scenario by moving the student to a different location in the classroom such a seat by the teacher's desk away from the other students. A score of 4 signified that the action which the teacher would have taken to address the situation would have involved stopping class and asking the student, or students, who had committed the offense to step into the hallway for a discussion about their behavior. A score of 5 indicated that the teacher, in reaction

to the event depicted in the video scenario, or in a real life situation similar to the scenario, would write a disciplinary referral on that student, sending them to an administrator's office, and removing them from the classroom for the rest of the period.

Video scenarios were chosen for this research because they offered a window into the thought processes, experiences, and practices of the teachers in ways that surveys and questionnaires did not offer. Using video scenarios to augment the written survey, according to Poulu (2006), allowed the researcher to "present respondents with a more concrete and unambiguous stimulant to refer to" (p. 52). According to Shavelson (1983) and Clark and Peterson (1986), video scenarios, or the policy-capturing method, were borrowed from research psychology for the study of teacher judgment processes (Poulu, 2006). Hubner (1991) suggested that research on educational decision-making benefits from the use of scenarios or similar analogue methods. He asserted that this type of research enabled the researcher to exercise greater control over their variables, and therefore increased the internal validity of their study (Hubner, 1991, p. 58). Poulu (2006) supported the use of video scenarios, in that through their use in research respondents could easily express their own perceptions on topics very familiar to them, but remain detached from them and safe from personal threat. The advantage, according to Poulu (2006) of this technique is that the respondents did not have to bias their responses, and give socially approved answers, since they did not perceive any danger of devaluing their personal image by giving sincere answers (p. 58). Poulu, referencing Kerlinger (1992), argued that "the use of scenarios offered a combination of expressive and objective ideas and projective methods, and further suggested that as such they should be increasingly used in psychological and educational research" (p. 58). By introducing an element of educational psychology to this

study, through use of video scenarios and teachers' reactions and perceptions about what they saw, it was hypothesized that this study would build upon the existing research knowledge in several fields

How the Study Addresses the Research Questions

The first research question asked: what are the differences, if any, between the way traditionally certified and alternatively certified middle school teachers who were new to the profession handled classroom management and discipline? It was addressed in that both types of teacher, traditionally certified and alternatively certified teachers, participated in the survey and gave answers to survey questions related to their certification programs, their preparedness to be effective classroom mangers and student disciplinarians, and submitted their responses to the video segments. It was determined that the answers provided by the teachers would provide valuable insight as to their feelings regarding their preparation programs and the realities that they faced as newly certified classroom teachers. By comparing the responses to the survey questionnaire it was surmised that whatever differences there might be between the traditionally certified and the alternatively certified teachers would become evident.

The second research question inquired: how did teachers who were new to the profession (1-to 5 years of experience) view their preparedness to manage their classrooms and their ability to deal with student disciplinary issues? It was addressed in that that after viewing each scenario each teacher gave the scenario a rating and indicated what action they would take regarding the infractions committed by the students represented in the videos. Outside of direct observation in the classroom, this as close as one could get to seeing how a teacher makes decisions regarding the disciplining of students. All of the data collected from the surveys and video scenario tests

will provide greater understanding of how the subject teachers not only view themselves as classroom mangers and disciplinarians, but how they would handle the situations depicted in the scenarios. Additionally, an independent samples *t*-test will be run to compare the scenario scores by certification type which will or will not show a statistical significance between the two groups.

Summary

The research study designed for this project involved the use of a take-home survey that studied teacher certification programs and how teachers felt about their role as teachers; specifically, their role as classroom mangers. Included in the survey were questions regarding their time in the profession, the grades they taught, the content area that they taught, and their feelings about teaching in general. This was followed up by a face-to-face meeting in the teacher's classroom, where they viewed and rated video scenarios of students breaking classroom rules that were of a discretionary nature on a one to five Likert scale. The data from these were then examined to distinguish whether or not there was a discernible difference in the way teachers of each certification type managed their classrooms by looking at how they handled student discipline, and if their disciplinary practices were overly severe.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

For this study, six urban and suburban school districts in central Texas were used. The teachers from these schools self-selected to participate in the study after responding to an e-mail request to participate in a take-home survey, which was sent out to all of the teachers on each campus. Initial approval to invite teachers to participate in the study was granted by the districts and then by the principals of each campus. The respondents, 30 in all, were teachers new to the profession with five years or less of experience in the classroom. Of these, 12 of the participants were traditionally certified teachers, and 18 were alternatively certified. This study focused on the responses each of the teachers gave to the basic survey questions and the ratings each of the teachers gave to the student scenario videos.

The results of the study are presented in the following order: first, descriptive analyses of the questions of the demographic and interview questions are discussed; second, the responses to the video scenarios of the discretionary disciplinary offenses are analyzed. Within each of these sections, the results between the two groups of teachers, traditionally certified and alternatively certified, were compared against each other to determine whether there were any significant differences between the two groups. In the data that follow, the schools were represented by the letters A through F, and the teachers were represented by numbers. For example, a teacher from School A was represented by the label A1, A2, A3, etc. A teacher from School B was represented by the label B1, B2, etc. Each teacher was then assigned an A for alternative certification or a T for traditional certification. For example, an alternative certification teacher

form school A would be identified as A1A, and a traditionally certified teacher form school A would be identified as A3T.

Teacher Survey Data

Each teacher answered a set of survey questions regarding demographic characteristics, and questions about their teacher preparation programs, followed by additional questions regarding how prepared they felt to manage their classrooms, and how they felt about teaching in general. The surveys were take-home documents that were sent to the individual teachers via e-mail after they had agreed to take part in the study. When they had completed the survey questions, each teacher returned the document directly to the researcher. Included in the document were the days and times that they would be available to view and rate the video scenarios. A hard copy of the survey was turned in at the face-to-face meeting, which took place in their classrooms, where they then viewed and rated the student scenarios. The number of surveys collected from the respondents was 30 in all (N=30). Of that number, all of the respondents viewed and rated the video scenarios. When all of the data were collected, the survey responses and ratings of the video scenarios were then separated by certification type (Alternative Certification Teachers, N = 18/ Traditional Certification Teachers, N = 12).

It was found that the average age of the teachers was 34 years old. When broken down by certification type, the average age of the alternative certification teachers was 37 years old, and the average age of the traditionally certified teachers was 32 years old. Of the sample, there were 14 males and 16 females. Of these, 10 males and eight females were alternatively certified

teachers, and four male and eight female teachers were traditionally certified. The ethnicity of the teachers was reported as follows: of the alternative certification teachers, 13 identified themselves as White, two as Latino, and three as African-American. Four of the traditional certification teachers identified themselves as White, five as Latino, and three as African-American.

The subjects that the teachers taught were as follows: of the alternatively certified teachers, it was reported that four taught mathematics, six taught science, two taught social studies, four taught English language arts and reading, and two taught special education, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses. In the traditional certification cohort, three taught mathematics, one taught science, two taught social studies, four taught English language arts and reading, one taught music, and one taught health. The alternatively certified teachers averaged 3.2 years of teaching, compared to the traditionally certified teachers, who averaged 3.4 years teaching. Finally, among the alternatively certified teachers, two taught sixth grade, four taught seventh grade, and four taught eighth grade. Within this group, eight teachers reported that they taught multiple grades. Of the traditionally certified teachers three taught sixth grade, four taught seventh grade, and two taught eighth grade. Within this group three reported that they taught multiple grades. Among the alternatively certified teachers, 14 indicated that they had gotten their teacher orientation and preparation through a regional educational service center teacher certification program, three indicated that they had received their teacher certification through the I Teach Texas teacher certification program, and one had attended the A+ Texas Teachers Certification Program. Three of the traditionally certified teachers reported combined

Master's in Education with teacher certification, and nine had attended undergraduate teacher certification programs through their universities, while seeking a Bachelor's degree.

The following survey questions addressed how teachers felt about their readiness to teach and how they viewed themselves as teachers overall. The first question asked if they felt like they were ready to manage a classroom effectively when they started. Of the alternatively certified teachers, ten teachers stated that they felt that they were ready to manage their classrooms when they started teaching, while eight teachers reported that they were not ready. Among the group of traditionally certified teachers, six felt that they were ready to manage their classrooms when they first started teaching, while six indicated that they did not feel prepared.

The second question asked: what were the biggest challenges that you faced when you first started teaching? Among the alternatively certified teachers, 11 acknowledged that student behavior and discipline issues were the biggest challenges, one teacher reported that time constraints and deadlines were their biggest challenges, five teachers indicated that lesson planning and content delivery were their biggest challenges, and one teacher responded that 504 issues were a particularly time consuming part of their job. According to the Chambersburg Area School District (2014), Section 504 regulations require that decisions regarding eligibility, programs, related services, and accommodations be made by a group of persons knowledgeable about the student, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options for special education services (Section 504: Frequently Asked Questions & Answers, para. 2). The traditionally certified teachers replied similarly, in that eight teachers indicated that student behavior and discipline issues were their biggest challenges, followed by one teacher who specified that obtaining classroom resources was their biggest challenge. One teacher replied

that their biggest challenges were lesson planning and content delivery, with two teachers stating that their biggest challenges were 504 and special education issues.

The next question asked: do you feel that there was anything missing in your teacher preparation/training? The alternatively certified teachers responded in the following manner: Eleven teachers felt that they lacked training on how to manage a classroom and handle student discipline-real world experiences, two indicated that they would have preferred that their certification program had a student teaching component, three replied that training on time management, testing, and administrative duties would have been helpful, two indicated that there was nothing missing in their certification programs, and that they felt sufficiently prepared on day one. The traditionally certified teachers answered similarly: Nine teachers affirmed that their programs lacked training on how to manage a classroom and handle student discipline/real world experiences, three teachers stated that there was nothing missing in their certification programs, and that they felt that they were well prepared on day one. Finally, when asked how they felt about teaching now, 12 alternatively certified teachers responded that they loved teaching, and that they felt optimistic about their careers. Three teachers replied that they had learned how things worked in the classroom and that they knew what they were doing, while three teachers felt burned out and frustrated. Among the traditionally certified teachers, five teachers indicated that they loved teaching, and that they felt optimistic about their careers. Four teachers had learned how things worked in the classroom and knew what they were doing, while one teacher indicated that there was still more to learn. Lastly, two teachers indicated that for them, teaching became increasingly tougher year after year.

When the answers to the questions above were analyzed, the following information was revealed about the alternatively certified teachers: Many of them taught multiple grades; the majority of them taught either mathematics or science; when asked if they were ready to manage their classrooms on day one, over half replied that they were not ready; and lastly, 28 percent of the alternatively certified teachers felt that lesson planning and content delivery were significant challenges. The traditionally certified teachers reported similar results when replying to the question regarding being prepared to manage their classrooms on day one. Fifty percent agreed that they were ready, and 50% replied that they were not. Majorities of each certification type, 61% of alternative certification teachers and 75% of traditionally certified teachers, reported that they felt that their biggest challenge as a new teacher was how to manage a classroom and handle student discipline, or handle *real world* experiences. This survey showed that within both groups, there were roughly equal numbers of alternatively certified and the traditionally certified teachers who felt that they were ill-prepared to be effective classroom managers and student disciplinarians.

Student Scenario Videos

The students in the videos all tended to be what would commonly be referred to as *good kids*. The students who were selected to act in the video scenarios had a hard time acting out at first. Even when they really went *all out,* they acted tame compared to similar students in similar situations that I had experienced as a teacher. When each teacher sat down to view and rate the video scenarios, they were told to overlook the behaviors exhibited by the students in the scenarios, and to respond to each case as if it were their students who were committing the actions depicted in the scenarios. The tame quality of the student scenarios was relevant in that

some of the participant teachers still scored the video scenarios rather high, despite the *soft* nature of the discretionary offenses played out in the student scenario videos. Scenario A: Two students having a discussion during class; Scenario B: Student using a device during class; Scenario C: Student outburst/challenging teacher during class; Scenario D: Two students arguing during class; Scenario E: Student tardy to class; Scenario F: Student disagreement with teacher during class. Each teacher viewed the scenarios, which depicted the six aforementioned student scenarios. After viewing each the scenarios, the teachers were asked to rate the video on a five-point Likert scale. When the teachers finished with the sixth scenario, the test was complete.

Student Scenario Tests

In all, the teachers each viewed six individual scenarios from a group of five different scenario tests. The tests were randomly assigned to each teacher. The tests each had six scenarios of students breaking discretionary rules. In each scenario, when the students were asked to stop doing what they were doing, they disregarded the teacher by ignoring the request to stop. Each test differed in that there were students of different sex and ethnicity used in the scenarios. Tables were developed (Appendix C) showing how each teacher, of each certification type, scored each scenario. Included in the tables were the race and sex of the students in each student scenario, as well as the averages of the scores by certification type of the teacher and the differences between the two scores.

An ANOVA was run on each of the scenarios to ascertain if there was any difference in the ways teachers for both certification types responded to the scenarios. For Scenario A, there was no significant difference between groups. Only Scenario B showed significant difference between groups $F(1, 28) = 6.08$, $p = .02$. Scenarios C, D, E, and F between groups difference

approached significance, falling below the threshold which is typically $p = .05$. Lack of significant difference was certainly due to relatively low sample size (N = 30), which was a limitation of the study.

An ANOVA and independent samples *t*-test were conducted to compare teacher ratings of the six student video scenarios that each viewed, using the demographic characteristics of race and sex, as well as certification type. There are three typical assumptions for ANOVA; that each sample is an independent random sample, which they are. The next assumption is that the distribution of the response variable follows a normal distribution, which it does. And finally, the population variances were equal across responses for the group levels (Schmider, Ziegler, Danay, Beyer, & Bühner, 2010). The following tables (Table 4.1, and 4.2) represent the findings of the statistical tests run on the data where the main categories of analysis were the gender and ethnicity of the teachers.

Table 4.1

ANOVA

Mean (Gender)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.372	1	.372	.667	.421
Within Groups	15.614	28	.558		
Total	15.986	29			

**Not significant difference*

Table 4.2

ANOVA

Mean (Ethnicity)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.414	2	1.207	2.401	.110
Within Groups	13.573	27	.503		
Total	15.986	29			

**Not significant difference*

A one-way ANOVA was calculated on the effect that gender on the scores reported on the various student scenario tests. The ANOVA test looking at ethnicity was showed no significant difference between groups, F = (1, 28) = .7, p = .421. An additional one-way ANOVA was calculated on the effect that race on the scores reported on the various student scenario tests. The ANOVA test looking at race also showed no significant difference between groups, F = (2, 27) = 2.4, p = .110.

In addition, an independent samples *t*-test (Alt and Standard) was calculated on the effect of certification type on the scores. The independent samples *t*-test showed significant difference based upon certification type, F = (28, 25.493) = 5.6, p = .012. The R squared in this case was .203, indicating that 20.3% of the variance in the teachers' responses can be accounted for by their certification type.

Descriptive Analyses

The following descriptive analyses will show how each teacher form both certification types rated the scenarios they each viewed privately. The results of how each teacher rated each scenario will be presented in tables. Following each table are samples of how the individual groups of teachers responded to the scenarios. As was covered in Chapter 3, after viewing a

scenario, teachers were asked to rate the severity of the infraction depicted in the scenario on a one to five Likert scale. A score of 1 meant that the teacher had no reaction to the scenario, and therefore would not take any action in a real life situation similar to the one depicted in the video scenario. A score of 2 indicated that the teacher would have issued a verbal warning to the student, were the offense in the video scenario to take place in their classroom. A score of 3 meant that the teacher would take action to address the situation depicted in the video scenario by moving the student to a different seat, or a seat by the teacher's desk away from the other students. A score of 4 signified that the action which the teacher would have taken to address the situation would have involved stopping class and asking the student, or students, who had committed the offense to step into the hallway for a discussion about their behavior. A score of 5 indicated that the teacher, in reaction to the event depicted in the video scenario, or in a real life situation similar to the scenario, would write a disciplinary referral on that student, sending them to an administrator's office, and removing them from the classroom for the rest of the period. Table 4.3 summarizes the scoring scale for the Likert scale.

Table 4.3

Student Scenario Likert Scale Scoring

1 = no reaction
2 = verbal warning
3 = moving student
4 = hallway discussion
5 = disciplinary referral

Table, 4.4, shows each how each teacher scored each scenario. Also included is the gender, race, and certification type of each teacher.

Table 4.4

Teacher scenario scores including gender, race, and certification type of each teacher.

Teacher	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S 6	Gender	Race	Certification Type
A1	3	4	2	3	1	1	M	W	A
A2	3	4	4	5	2	2	F	W	A
A6	2	2	3	3	2	2	F	W	A
A8	3	2	3	2	3	2	M	W	A
B1	3	4	4	4	3	3	F	W	A
B3	3	5	5	4	3	4	F	W	A
C1	2	3	1	2	2	1	M	W	A
C2	3	3	4	3	2	2	M	W	A
C3	2	3	1	2	2	2	F	W	A
D1	2	3	3	4	2	4	F	W	A
D2	2	3	5	3	1	3	M	W	A
E1	4	5	5	5	4	3	F	W	A
E2	2	5	1	3	2	4	M	AfAm	A
E3	1	3	5	4	4	2	M	AfAm	A
E4	1	1	1	2	1	1	M	AfAm	A
E6	2	2	3	1	1	1	F	W	A
E7	2	2	2	2	2	2	M	W	A
F1	4	4	2	4	1	1	F	Lat	A
A3	2	2	3	3	1	1	F	W	T
A4	3	3	2	1	1	1	M	Lat	T
A5	2	3	2	1	2	1	M	Lat	T
A7	3	1	3	2	1	1	F	AfAm	T
B2	2	2	2	2	3	2	M	Lat	T
B4	2	3	2	3	2	1	F	Lat	T
B5	2	3	1	2	1	1	F	Lat	T
C4	3	3	3	4	1	3	M	W	T
D3	3	2	2	3	1	3	F	W	T
E5	1	1	2	2	1	1	F	AfAm	T
E8	2	1	2	3	3	2	F	AfAm	T
F2	3	3	2	2	1	1	M	W	T

** In Table 4.5 S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, and S6 represent Scenarios 1 through 6. Gender: M= Male, F= Female. Race: W= White, AfAm= African American, and Lat= Latino. Certification Type: A= Alternative, T= Traditional.*

The following section is organized according to the video scenarios, consisting of a description of the scenario video, a table representing the ratings that each teacher gave to the individual scenarios, and individual teachers' comments in regards to what they saw and how they would react in that situation are shown.

Scenario A Description

In Scenario A, two students were shown having a conversation not related to class during a teacher-led discussion. When they were asked by the teacher if what they were talking about was in any way related to what he was talking about, one student said "Yeah, sure," and went right back to what they were talking about. The teacher tried to redirect the students, but they did not acknowledge him and kept on talking to one another.

Teacher Responses to Scenario A

Both alternatively and traditionally certified teachers responded to the scenarios in ratings and through their open-ended comments. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 2.44, SD= .856) rated Scenario A slightly higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 2.33, SD = .651), though this does not represent a statistically significant difference. Table 4.4 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.5

Scenario A Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario A**	**Teacher**	**Scenario A**
A 1	3	**A 3**	2
A 2	3	**A 4**	3
A 6	2	**A 5**	2
A 8	3	**A 7**	3
B 1	3	**B 2**	2
B 3	3	**B 4**	2
C 1	2	**B 5**	2
C 2	3	**C 4**	3
C 3	2	**D3**	3
D 1	2	**E 5**	1
D 2	2	**E 8**	2
E 1	4	**F 2**	3
E 2	2	**Mean**	2.33
E 3	1		
E 4	1		
E 6	3		
E 7	2		
F 1	4		
Mean	2.44		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario A

The alternatively certified teachers responded in a similar manner toward Scenario A. Specifically, they indicated that the students showed a level of disrespect towards the teacher that called for immediate intervention. Teacher A1A expressed the view of the group, indicating "I would not let that slide. It wasn't too bad, but it was disrespectful." Similarly, Teacher C2A added that "Those boys were way out of line and way too loud. They didn't listen to the teacher after he tried to redirect them." Both teachers B1A and E1A suggested that they would separate the girls, leaning toward a strategy of redirection, rather than immediate referral to the office.

Teacher C1A put forward that "I would have asked them to relocate to different seats and to talk to me after class ended." Likewise, Teacher E2A indicated that in this case he would "Give them a warning and separate them. I might even talk to the parents about their behavior."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario A

Although the responses of the traditionally certified teachers also indicate that the students' behavior was unacceptable, they also presented a more tempered approach to discipline. Teacher F2T remarked, "Those students were disrespectful of the teacher to his face, in front of the other students." Similarly, Teacher A7T stated that "it was serious enough that I might consider writing them up. I don't like how they blew off the teacher." However, in contrast to their peers, most of the traditionally certified teachers responded to Scenario A in a relatively less stringent manner. Specifically, Teacher A3T expressed the feelings of the group, noting simply "it's not too bad." With a similar approach, Teachers C5T and C4T indicated the need to redirect the students. Teacher A5T proposed separating the students and talking them individually outside of class to let them know that how they acted was "unacceptable classroom behavior." Furthermore Teacher D3T observed that "Those students were causing a commotion. I know that students like to talk, but that was pretty bad. They would have to see me later about their behavior." Teacher E5T added that in this case she would have "gone over to them and stood between them as well as inviting the girls to share with the class the topic of their discussion."

Scenario B Description

In Scenario B, a student is shown using an electronic device in class during a teacher-led discussion. When asked by the teacher to put the device away, the student says "O.K." and

continues to look at the device. The teacher reacts by telling the student "Put it away now!" to which the student responds by shrugging, continuing in the use of their device, even putting their feet up on an adjacent chair.

Teacher Responses to Scenario B

Both alternatively and traditionally certified teachers responded to the scenarios in ratings and through their open-ended comments. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 3.22, SD = 1.17) rated Scenario B higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 2.25, SD = .866). In this scenario there was a main effect where teacher certification was concerned, F(38.16)=6.07, p=.020 representing a statistically significant difference. Table 4.5 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.6

Scenario B Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario B**	**Teacher**	**Scenario B**
A 1	4	**A 3**	2
A 2	4	**A 4**	3
A 6	2	**A 5**	2
A 8	3	**A 7**	1
B 1	4	**B 2**	2
B 3	5	**B 4**	3
C 1	3	**B 5**	3
C 2	3	**C 4**	3
C 3	3	**D3**	2
D 1	3	**E 5**	1
D 2	3	**E 8**	2
E 1	5	**F 2**	3
E 2	5	**Mean**	2.25
E 3	3		
E 4	1		
E 6	2		
E 7	2		
F 1	4		
Mean	3.22		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario B

The alternatively certified teachers were more punitive in their responses to Scenario B. Several teachers indicated that the student in the scenario showed a level of disrespect that called for something more than a verbal warning. For example, Teacher E2A expressed a particularly strong reaction, by stating that "the student was so openly defiant, even after being asked to put it away. What else can you do but write them up?" Teacher D2A made the comment that "It was more severe in that it was more personal in nature, very disrespectful." Similarly, Teacher B3A added "What that boy did was blatantly disrespectful. I wouldn't stand for it. You can't do that

and stay in my classroom." Teacher C3A indicated that in this case it was more than a discretionary decision by affirming that "It is a solid rule that students cannot use devices in class. That, and the student disregarded the teacher." Several teachers suggested that their most likely course of action would be to confiscate the phone and make the student get it after class. However, many of the teachers' comments reflected those of Teacher E1A, who stated that "the student in the scenario had no respect for the teacher, commenting that he blew him off. I would not tolerate that." Teacher A1A took it a step further by affirming that "Kids do bad stuff with phones in class like recording videos of teachers or other students. Besides, that kid should have been paying attention to the teacher."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario B

The traditionally certified teachers responded to Scenario B in a less severe manner. Although their responses indicated that the students' behavior was clearly against the rules, they also presented a more moderated approach towards how they would handle the situation. Even though Teacher A4T noted that the student in the scenario "showed a lot of attitude and was openly dismissive of the teacher," the majority of the teachers' views reflected those of Teacher F2T, who remarked "All students have phones. They know the rules. I would have taken it and made him come get it after class." Similarly, Teacher A7Tcommented "All kids have phones and they use them all of the time. It's not something I get worked up about." A majority of the traditionally certified teachers took a similar approach, stating all that was required in this situation was to "take the phone and have him collect it after school."

Scenario C Description

Scenario Test C portrayed a student disturbing class by challenging the teacher on subject of teacher-led discussion. The student stands up challenges the teacher by asking, "Why do we have to know about this stuff? What does that have to do with my life anyway?" The teacher asks the student to refrain from commenting and sit down. The student does not sit down and continues their line of argument by stating that they feel that was is being discussed is stupid.

Teacher Responses to Scenario C

Teachers from both certification types responded to the same scenario videos, recording their numerical response, along with open-ended comments. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 3.00, SD = 1.50) rated Scenario C slightly higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 2.17, SD = .578). Though approaching significant (p=.077), this does not represent a statistically significant difference. Table 4.6 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.7

Scenario C Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario C**	**Teacher**	**Scenario C**
A 1	2	**A 3**	3
A 2	4	**A 4**	2
A 6	3	**A 5**	3
A 8	2	**A 7**	3
B 1	4	**B 2**	2
B 3	5	**B 4**	2
C 1	1	**B 5**	3
C 2	3	**C 4**	3
C 3	1	**D3**	2
D 1	3	**E 5**	2
D 2	5	**E 8**	1
E 1	5	**F 2**	2
E 2	1	**Mean**	2.17
E 3	5		
E 4	1		
E 6	2		
E 7	2		
F 1	2		
Mean	3.00		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario C

The alternatively certified teachers varied in their responses to Scenario C. Teacher A2A's statement in regards to this scenario mirrored those of the majority of the group when she stated, "Its disrespectful, she stood up and challenged the teacher." Several of the teachers indicated that the student in the scenario showed a level of disrespect towards the teacher which required a direct response. Teacher E3A conveyed the view of the group in his response, noting "What that student did was way out of line and that they needed to learn that what they did was unacceptable in the classroom." Along the same line, teacher B3A added "That student was so disrespectful towards that teacher, standing up and sassing him like that." Correspondingly,

Teacher A8A expressed a relatively strong reaction, noting that "that student kept on after being addressed by the teacher, it was disturbing and disrespectful." Teacher B1A added that the student was "outright disruptive and disrespectful. I would have taken them out into the hallway for a discussion on classroom manners." Conversely, several teachers proposed that this situation presented what E2A referred to as "a good chance to talk about why education is so important."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario C

Overall, the traditionally certified teachers responded to Scenario C in a less harsh manner than their alternatively certified peers, with Teacher A4T commenting that "that student was pretty rude, but things like that are good teaching moments." Their collective responses tended to mirror the comments of Teacher A7T who stated that "what that student did was out of line, but wouldn't send them to the office; I would ask them to talk to me later either outside class or sometime later" Teacher B4T added that "the student was trying to get attention was going about it the wrong way. I would have pulled them out of class to find what was going on and see if there was anything I could do." Similarly, Teacher B3T indicated that it was a "great opportunity to talk about content and the importance of education." Additionally, Teacher B2T suggested that "there was something going on with that student. I would have asked them to see me outside of the class, maybe sending them to a counselor."

Scenario D Description

Scenario Test D portrayed two students arguing loudly in class during teacher-led discussion. The teacher tells them that they are disturbing to class, and to end their discussion.

The instigator sighed, "Whatever!" Subsequently, the students go back to their argument, ignoring the admonitions of the teacher.

Teacher Responses to Scenario D

Both groups of teachers responded numerically to the videos, and through open-ended comments. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 3.11, SD = 1.132) rated Scenario D higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 2.33, SD = .888). Though approaching significance (p=.055), it is not a statistically significant difference. Table 4.7 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.8

Scenario D Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario D**	**Teacher**	**Scenario D**
A 1	3	**A 3**	3
A 2	5	**A 4**	2
A 6	3	**A 5**	1
A 8	2	**A 7**	2
B 1	4	**B 2**	2
B 3	4	**B 4**	3
C 1	2	**B 5**	2
C 2	2	**C 4**	4
C 3	2	**D3**	3
D 1	4	**E 5**	2
D 2	3	**E 8**	3
E 1	5	**F 2**	2
E 2	3	**Mean**	2.33
E 3	4		
E 4	2		
E 6	1		
E 7	2		
F 1	4		
Mean	3.11		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario D

In their responses to Scenario D, the alternatively certified teachers were mixed in their responses. A number of them indicated that the students in the scenario behaved in a manner that not only disrespected the teacher, but disturbed the whole class. Teacher A2A observed that "the girl's argument was distracting the whole class and they disrespected the teacher after he told them to stop." On a similar note, Teacher A1A declared that "it was a big distraction and disrespectful of both the teacher and their classmates." Teacher E1A added that the whole incident was "very disturbing, a disruption for the whole class, and was disrespectful to both the class and the teacher." Likewise, Teacher D1A specified, "That conversation took over the whole class and merited not only moving them, but speaking to them outside of class right then and there." However, there were several teachers who felt that what occurred was not uncommon. For example, Teacher E2A stated that what she saw offered "a good chance to talk about why education is so important."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario D:

Generally, the traditionally certified teachers responded to Scenario D in a less punitive manner than their alternatively certified peers. Their shared responses were similar to those of Teacher B5T, who remarked that "you have to pick your battles. I see girls do that every day. They were rude, but it happens." With a similar tone, Teacher F2T affirmed "Sure, it was disruptive, but it would be a good time to review acceptable classroom behaviors and procedures." Teacher A5T made the commented:

If I was to get upset every time students did that I would be a miserable person. Kids do that all of the time. Shut the situation down, separate them if you have to and talk about it after class.

All in all, most of the teachers advocated a course of action that recommended diffusing the situation, separating the students, and talking to them about their behavior after class.

Scenario E Description

Scenario E portrayed a student arriving late to class, after the bell had rung, without a permission slip or a good reason for tardiness. The teacher tells them that the late bell has rung, and asks them why they are late. The teacher then asks if they have an excuse for being late to which the student aggressively responded, "I was outside and didn't hear the bell," dropping their backpack loudly on the floor.

Teacher Responses to Scenario E

Both alternatively and traditionally certified teachers responded numerically to the videos, and offered open-ended comments. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 2.11, SD = .963) rated Scenario E slightly higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 1.50, SD = .798). Though approaching significance (p=.80), it is not a statistically significant difference. Table 4.8 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.9

Scenario E Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario E**	**Teacher**	**Scenario E**
A 1	1	**A 3**	1
A 2	2	**A 4**	1
A 6	2	**A 5**	2
A 8	3	**A 7**	1
B 1	3	**B 2**	3
B 3	3	**B 4**	2
C 1	2	**B 5**	1
C 2	2	**C 4**	1
C 3	2	**D3**	1
D 1	4	**E 5**	1
D 2	1	**E 8**	3
E 1	4	**F 2**	1
E 2	2	**Mean**	1.5
E 3	2		
E 4	1		
E 6	1		
E 7	2		
F 1	1		
Mean	2.11		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario E

In their responses to Scenario E, a good portion of the alternatively certified teachers replied that what occurred in the scenario was nothing to get too upset about. For instance Teacher A6A pointed out that "If you get all worked up about kids being late to class, you're not going to have a good day. They do it all the time." Teacher E2A observed that "students are always coming in without a slip or excuse. There are rules about it, but I don't really do a good job of enforcing that one." Teacher B3A had this to add: "What I saw happens in every class. Though the school has procedures in place to deal with tardys, it really depends on the student

and their track record." However, several of the teachers felt that they should follow the school's code of conduct regarding tardys, which usually involves the student having to leave class and go get a tardy slip; or the teachers felt that the student seemed troubled and should see a counselor. For example, Teacher B1A commented, "I would follow the school code of conduct which required the student to leave class to get a tardy slip and that the parents would be notified of the infraction." Teacher D1A indicated that, in this case "the student in the video was confrontational and should probably go see an administrator or counselor."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario E

The traditionally certified teachers' responses to Scenario E generally mirrored those of their alternatively certified peers. Teacher C4T, in reference to the scenario declared that "the student did what they were supposed to do, not really a problem. Pick your fights, stuff like that happens every day." Most of them made similar comments, affirming that what occurred in the scenario was either nothing to worry about or that if a student made a habit of being late to class, then they would take the appropriate actions. Teacher F2T stated that "it happens every day. It might be a good time to get to know the student better by asking what was going on and if I could help him out." Teacher D3T indicated:

> I would have let that student sit down. There are some kids who push the rules, and I make them get tardy slips, but most kids are late every now and then. I don't see any reason to make a big deal out of it.

Some of the teachers felt duty-bound to follow their school's code of conduct and make the student leave class and get a tardy slip. For instance, Teacher E5T pointed out that school policy dictated that unexcused tardiness incurred an automatic lunch detention. Teacher E8T offered

that “it all depended on how often each student was late to class and if it was habitual then she would take it up with the Assistant Principal and schedule a parent-teacher conference.”

Scenario F Description

Scenario Test F portrayed a student not agreeing with the teacher’s decision regarding a grade on an assignment. In this scenario the teacher is passing back a graded assignment and comments to each student on his or her grade. When he gets to one student, the teacher tells the student that they could have done better on the test, to which the student rolls their eyes and loudly proclaims, “Well, I don’t care,” and pushes the paper off of their desk and on to the floor.

Teacher Responses to Scenario F

Both alternatively and traditionally certified teachers rated the videos numerically and through their open-ended responses. The alternatively certified teachers (M = 2.22, SD = 1.06) rated Scenario F higher than the traditionally certified teachers (M = 1.50, SD = .798). Though approaching significance (p=.077), it is not a statistically significant difference. Table 4.9 shows teacher responses from both groups.

Table 4.10

Scenario F Ratings for Alternatively and Traditionally Certified Teachers

Alternative Certification		*Traditional Certification*	
Teacher	**Scenario F**	**Teacher**	**Scenario F**
A 1	1	**A 3**	1
A 2	2	**A 4**	1
A 6	2	**A 5**	1
A 8	2	**A 7**	1
B 1	3	**B 2**	2
B 3	4	**B 4**	1
C 1	1	**B 5**	1
C 2	2	**C 4**	3
C 3	2	**D3**	3
D 1	2	**E 5**	1
D 2	3	**E 8**	2
E 1	3	**F 2**	1
E 2	4	**Mean**	1.5
E 3	4		
E 4	1		
E 6	1		
E 7	2		
F 1	1		
Mean	2.22		

Alternatively Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario F

The alternative teachers in their responses to Scenario F were mixed in their reactions to what occurred in the video scenario; but many of them seemed to favor a more punitive approach to handling the situation. Teacher B3A acknowledged, "That student threw that paper on the floor and sassed the teacher. I would definitely pull them out and talk to them about their behavior. Kids can't act like that and get away with it." Teacher E3A observed that the student was "openly defiant and causing a commotion that disrupted the whole class." Additionally, Teacher D2A maintained that "the student in that video was really defiant, so that is something that usually requires a little more attention." Several of the teachers had similar responses which

mentioned that what occurred in the scenario was disturbing or disrespectful towards the teacher. Conversely, Teacher D1A made the comment that "it was a good opportunity to help a student hat seemed to need some guidance."

Traditionally Certified Teachers' Responses to Scenario F

The traditionally certified teachers' responses to Scenario F contrasted from their alternatively certified colleagues in that a majority of them tended to think what they saw as nothing to worry about and/or a good teaching moment. Teacher B2T offered that this scenario presented a teacher with an opportunity to help a student who might need some encouragement. Similarly, Teacher E8T commented that "it was a good teachable moment. I get this all of the time." Teacher B5T observed, "The student was obviously upset about something else. I have asked them to see me after class." Teacher A5T indicated that what had happened provided "a good time to talk about education, school, and why it all matters." Teacher B4T stated that "I would have written 'See Me' on the paper, rather than put them on the spot like that." The sternest proposed actions were those of C4T, affirming that "if a student has a problem with a grade they can see me later. Class time is not the time to gripe about grades." On a similar note, Teacher D3T remarked that "the student was probably having a bad day, but they didn't have to be so rude. Kids can't just disrespect you like that."

Summary

In this chapter, the teachers' responses to the teacher survey and the teachers' ratings of the student scenarios were analyzed. It was determined that the teachers of both certification types responded similarly to the survey questions regarding their perceptions of their own readiness to teach and to questions regarding their roles as classroom managers and student

disciplinarians. However, in regards to the certification programs each attended, there were statistically significant differences in the ways that each scored the student scenario videos. An overall assessment of the data showed that while teachers of both certification types expressed concerns about their preparedness to handle classroom management and student discipline in their responses to the teacher survey questions, there was a clear statistical difference in how they rated the video scenarios depicting students breaking discretionary classroom rules. In addition to the ratings that each group of teachers gave, there were also differences in the oral responses the teacher gave regarding the various scenarios that they viewed. Overall, the alternatively certified teachers tended to respond what they saw in harsher language than their traditionally certified colleagues. The traditionally certified teachers seemed more experienced in how to de-escalate the situation, where many of the alternatively certified teachers tended to escalate the situation, taking a short term view which led to their being more punitive in their scoring of the scenarios and their comments regarding how what they saw made them feel and what actions they would take.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH

"In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunities of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right that must be made available on equal terms."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954)

The following chapter will review the key findings of the study and its limitations. Following these are an overview of the implications of the study and recommendations for future research which will conclude with final thoughts and lessons learned.

Key Findings

The first research question asked: what were the differences, if any, between the way traditionally certified and alternatively certified middle school teachers who were new to the profession handle classroom management and discipline? Looking at how each group answered the teacher survey questions regarding their teacher preparation programs and their teaching concerns, both groups gave roughly similar responses. In the teacher survey both groups responded comparably when asked if they were ready to manage their classrooms when they started teaching. A key finding of the survey data was that less than half of the teachers in each group responded that they were ready to be classroom managers when they first started, the majority of both groups expressing concerns about their classroom management abilities. This was a key takeaway in that When asked what were the biggest challenges that they faced when they first started teaching a majority of each group indicated that student behavior and discipline issues were their biggest challenges. A majority of both groups of teachers, when asked if they felt that there was anything missing in their teacher preparation/training, replied that there was a

lack of training in classroom management and student discipline. Overall, it was observed that a majority of both alternatively certified and traditionally certified teachers felt that their teacher training programs could have done more to prepare them for the real life situations that they faced as novice classroom managers. This was especially true where interaction with students and student discipline were concerned.

Quantitative Findings

While the survey questions revealed no substantive differences between groups, their responses to student scenario videos revealed group differences. The differences between the two groups appeared when the teacher ratings of the student scenario videos were analyzed. What became clearly evident was that the alternatively certified teachers' responses indicated a more rigid and punitive approach to student discipline than their traditionally certified counterparts. Quantitative analysis revealed that in one scenario, Scenario B, there was a statistically significant difference in the ways that traditionally certified and alternatively certified handled classroom management and discipline. While Scenario A was not found to show a statistically significant difference, Scenarios C, D, E, and F approached significance. Teacher responses to Scenario B showed significant group differences at the .02 level, with the alternatively certified teachers recommending a relatively more stringent response than the traditionally certified teachers. This scenario showed a student using an electronic device in class during a teacher-led discussion. When asked by the teacher to put the device away, the student agreed to put it away and continued to look at the device. The teacher reacted to this by sternly warning the student to put the device away immediately to which the student responded by shrugging, and continuing in the use of their device. This is important in that all of the

infractions that were chosen to be used in the scenario videos were events that were likely to occur in a classroom on a daily basis, and for the alternatively certified teachers to choose more heavy-handed reactions to these incidents is a cause for concern. Overreacting to these daily infractions is a sign of poor classroom management skills and could lead to students being routinely sent out of the classroom, which could lead to students disconnecting from school, and in some case dropping out of school altogether. However, given the fact that only one scenario showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups, the main finding was that majorities of teachers from both groups indicated that felt unprepared to handle classroom management and student discipline issues when they completed their certification programs and started teaching.

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between alternatively certified teachers and traditionally certified teachers specifically looking at who wrote a referral and rated a video scenario a "5." The relation between these variables was significant, x^2 (2, N = 30) = 5.00, p= .025, p<.05, Cramér's V= .408. This shows that there is a significant positive correlation between having one or more rating of "5" and being alternatively certified is very strong (.408) (Diener-West, 2008).

Survey Data Findings

Using quantitative statistical analysis, it was shown that there were statistically significant differences in the ways the two groups of teachers handled the student discipline issues presented in the student scenarios. A review of the data that was collected from the teacher during the scenarios supported the quantitative finding that there were differences in the ways the two groups of teachers handled classroom management and discipline issues. In their

responses to the video scenarios the two groups of teachers varied, sometimes widely, in their comments. Both groups of teachers indicated that the scenarios represented situations they encountered every day in the classroom. The chief difference related to how each group perceived and would have handled the situations depicted in the scenarios. The second research question asked: how do teachers who are new to the profession (one to five years of experience) view their preparedness to manage their classrooms and their ability to deal with student disciplinary issues? The question can be answered by looking at how the two groups of teachers answered the initial teacher survey questions. The lack of preparedness that they felt was demonstrated in their reactions to the student scenario videos. Both the traditionally certified teachers and their alternatively certified counterparts felt that what occurred in the video scenarios were direct challenges to the teacher's authority, and required the teacher to show authority by resorting to disciplinary actions which in some cases would have led to students being removed from the classroom.

Diffusing rather than escalating. Looking at the responses both groups of teachers gave, many teachers felt that what they saw depicted in the scenarios was defiant and disrespectful, something that called that called for a more stringent course of action. Rather than employing what Darling-Hammond and Prince (2007) referred to as a "variety of learning techniques" (p. 4) they instead chose to intensify the situation through the use of heavy-handed disciplinary actions such as writing a discipline referral on the student or removing the student from the classroom rather than attempting to de-escalate the situation and move on. What this shows is that these teachers felt unprepared to deal with these situations and were inclined to resort to harsher disciplinary practices as a quick fix to the problem.

Creating long term relationships with teachers. Considering the differences in the ways that both groups of teachers tended to react to what they witnessed in the student scenarios, it became clear that the two groups took a different view of their roles as teachers and how they should relate to students. The alternatively certified teachers often saw what they were trying to do as asserting their authority and showing the students that they were the ones in control and not using the moment to foster a long-term relationship with their students. This stands in sharp contrast to the traditionally certified teachers who felt that most of what they saw could be handled in the classroom, often seeking a more personal solution to the problem. According to Wetz (2010), building these long-term relationships, which was covered in Chapter 2, is fundamental to the educational process. Conversely, relying on office referral may have the unintended consequence of compromising the relationship of trust between student and teacher.

You have to pick your battles. Hess (2002) stipulated that successful teaching often relied upon what he referred to as "various hard-to-judge personal qualities" (p. 173). In reviewing the comments and actions of the traditionally certified and alternatively certified teachers, it was apparent that when confronted by the situations depicted in the videos there was a difference in opinions on the appropriate course of action to take. Generally speaking, some teachers chose to make a point, or show their authority, while others tended to reflect on the situation before making a disciplinary decision, many commenting that it was wiser to "pick your battles" than get worked up over every little thing that students do on a daily basis.

Considering the context of the infraction. Considering that the scenarios depicted in the videos included what a majority of the teachers saw as everyday occurrences, it was interesting to see how each group judged what they saw. Reviewing the comments related to the

scenarios, most of the alternatively certified teachers felt that what they saw was very disturbing, a disruption for the whole class, and that what had occurred was disrespectful to both the class and the teacher. For them, the only course of action was to go by the book and use disciplinary actions as tools with which to establish their authority. Clearly, they felt directly challenged by the student, and did not consider what might be going on with that student they cause the behavior. These attitudes parallel the research of Wayman, Foster, Mantle-Bromley, and Wilson (2003), who found that the chief area of concern for the alternatively certified teachers was effective instruction and classroom management (p. 38). Conversely in the present study, the traditionally certified teachers felt that what they saw in the video scenarios was disruptive, but in most cases was nothing that they felt could not be quickly redirected. These actions and attitudes showed that rather than relying on school disciplinary policies, the traditionally certified teachers were thinking on their feet, rather than being reactionary.

Discussion

In Chapter 2, it was stated that schools represent the quintessential knowledge industry, and as such, teachers are the archetypal knowledge workers. Reflecting back on the human capitol theory and teacher certification material covered in the literature review, the question was asked, does the teacher prepared by the cheaper, quicker program represent a good investment by the school or district seeking capable knowledge workers? The basic argument presented was that where teachers and teacher certification programs are concerned, you get what you pay for. In looking at the research undertaken for this study, it could be concluded that alternative certification programs had, in providing a quicker route to the classroom and cutting corners, produced teachers who were less prepared than their traditionally certified colleagues. Blaug

(1976) argued that one of the key concepts of human capital theory was that people generally spent on themselves in diverse ways, not for the sake of present gratification, but for the sake of future financial and profits. By applying that argument to teacher certification, it can be argued that those seeking to become highly qualified teachers through traditional certification programs made greater investments in time and money in order to become more qualified, higher quality educators, while those who sought certification through alternative routes invested relatively less in trying to get quicker access to a teaching job. As this study pointed out, there was a concern by clear majorities in both groups of teachers that they felt unprepared to handle the rigors of classroom management and student discipline when they first started. A lack of preparation that led many of them to resolve the discretionary disciplinary issues depicted in the scenarios with overly harsh disciplinary actions. Research has shown this approach to discipline costs the school time and money through teachers' inability to effectively manage their classrooms and handle student discipline issues.

At the center of the problems related to over disciplining-students are zero tolerance policies. Zero tolerance policies were the product of the national drug policies and the rise of student related violence in the 1990s (Skiba and Peterson, 1999). These policies took student discipline to a much harsher level by mandating more severe punishments for both discretionary and non-discretionary infractions. Increasingly, these punishments led to a student being removed from the classroom, being suspended, or being placed in a disciplinary alternative educational placement (DAEPs); or worse, they were sentenced to juvenile detention facilities. Whatever the final disciplinary decision was, it usually involved the student being removed from the classroom and missing valuable class time. According to Morgan, Salomon, Plotkin, and

Cohen (2014), "zero tolerance policies and the added security to enforce them, have sometimes had the unintended consequence of causing some staff, students, and their families to feel the campus is less welcoming or less conducive to learning" (xvii).

For too many students, the inflexible disciplinary system and zero tolerance policies became a gateway to either DAEPs or the Juvenile Justice System. The research in this area shows how minor infractions often led to a student being removed from the classroom and/or being suspended from school. These actions have been shown to have a disruptive effect on a student's willingness to stay in school. Often, this process led to students dropping out of school altogether. What happened to the students that dropped out due to disciplinary issues? According to a 2007 report by Texas Appleseed complied by Fowler and Monger, various studies by national experts in the fields of education, criminal justice, and mental health have determined a link between dropout rates and incarceration. These findings were confirmed in Texas, where research showed that a third of the juveniles sent to a disciplinary education facility operated by the Texas Youth Commission drop out of school. Additionally, more than 80% of Texas adult prison inmates are dropouts (Fowler, D.F., & Monger, J., 2007).

On a similar note, Morgan et al. (2014) suggested that in order to prevent students from being over-disciplined, schools should provide special training and professional development on school climate and classroom management issues to all of the faculty and administration. By offering staff training and supports in classroom management, the authors suggested that the participating school or district would see increased teacher retention, improved school safety, full use of instructional time, and improved student engagement in learning (Morgan et al., 2014)). In their 2014 guide for teachers, the National Opportunity to

Learn Campaign suggested that schools adopt restorative practices to stem the tide of students being removed from classrooms and getting caught up in the juvenile justice system. Restorative practices are those that proactively built and sustained healthy relationships and promoted a sense of community that prevented and addressed conflict and misconduct. This aligns with the finding of the present study with respect to how the traditionally certified teachers took a long-term view with respect to the relational implications of disciplinary actions. The restorative practices that were suggested in the guide offered individual schools and school districts the ability to address student conduct, classroom/school rule violations, and to develop a positive school climate and the improve school culture. Restorative practices could improve student and teacher relationships--even those between educators, which were important because their behavior often served as a model for students. Finally, they allowed all members of the school community, faculty and administration, to develop and implement a school's adopted core values (National Opportunity to Learn Campaign, 2014).

The value of offering specialized teacher training and adopting restorative practices cannot be overstated. In their research on teacher quality Suell and Piotrowski (2007) concluded that classroom management and student discipline practices were key variables which contributed to teacher quality and positive student outcomes. Goldhaber and Brewer (2000), as well as Hanushek (1986, 1997), stipulated that having a good teacher in every classroom was important, and that having a good teacher significantly improved a student's academic progress. What can be assumed is that by using the terms *good* or *effective* in relation to teachers, these researchers were describing a teacher that not only knew their content area, but could effectively manage their classrooms and handle student discipline situations.

Limitations of Study

The limitations of the study were varied. First among them were the student participants who acted in the student scenario videos. Each one was selected by their principal for their exemplary academics and/or good behavior. Participants who might have volunteered, rather than those that were hand-picked because of positive student attributes might have given more accurate depictions of discretionary rule-breaking. As each viewing session began, it was pointed out to the teacher how tame the students acting out the scenarios in the video were; and it was asked of the teacher to look beyond that, and to imagine that the students in the scenarios were their actual students.

Conducting the video scenario test in a face-to-face meeting was an additional limitation. Because of the confidentiality agreement in the original Institutional Review Board regarding the use of the student scenario videos and the confidentiality of the students in them, I could not send out copies of the various scenario tests. It was determined that the best way to proceed was to administer the tests in person in each teacher's classroom to make them feel more at ease about the procedure. A limitation of this approach was that it was conducted in an artificial environment where the teachers were responding to me as a researcher, even though I had made the effort to position myself more as a colleague rather than an outsider.

An additional limitation was the sample size of teachers used in the study. Only 30 teachers were used. The study answered the research answered the research questions sufficiently, but would have shown more had a greater number of teachers been used. However, had the administrators that were approached in the beginning of this study been more willing, more teachers would have used. Research of this nature only addresses a narrow aspect of

teacher behavior within the spectrum of school discipline. Little will be done in addressing this problem until researchers can get at the data of who is disciplining which children, and see if certain teachers may be over-disciplining students. The study undertaken in this dissertation did just that in that it indicated the certification type of teachers, along with their respective approaches to student discipline. Until school-level data related to which teachers are disciplining which students are made available, not much more can be done.

Implications

Implications for the current study are presented in the areas of research, theory and practice. While the limitations of sampling dampen potential generalization of the findings, the study adds to the research on student discipline in a variety of ways.

Implications for Research. The methods undertaken in this study, specifically the use of student video scenarios, offer a new model of studying teacher impressions of student behavior. Specifically, the use of student scenarios is an effective way to replicate classroom practice, allowing for focus on specific student behaviors. While the present study compared the views of teachers from varying certification types, the scenario approach could be used to evaluate the responses of teachers from a range of groups.

Implications for Theory. Human capital theory was the lens through which teacher certification programs were viewed in this study. This study provided a theoretical basis for understanding issues relating to student discipline and teacher certification.

Implications for Practice. In comparing the literature used in this dissertation, and the findings of the actual study, it was clear that there were valid concerns about the lack of preparation in both types of certification programs and the overall effectiveness of the candidates

these programs produce. The study undertaken for this dissertation pointed out significant differences in group responses. The implication for practice was that campuses must provide additional professional development to supplement the lack of training on student discipline received by amo0ng all teachers.

Recommendations for Future Research

With the national spotlight on teacher quality and a growing body of concentrated research that emphasized the deleterious effects of classroom mismanagement and student discipline, it would be wise for those in the business of training and certifying teachers to improve their teacher certification programs to include rigorous training in classroom management and student discipline. Given the conclusions made by the National Council on Teacher Quality (2014), and Boyd et al. (2008), and the findings of the study undertaken for this dissertation, a logical next step would be incorporate methods like the student scenario videos and other training which focuses on real time classroom training and other hands-on opportunities. I recommend that in future studies, a much larger sample of teachers be used to allow for sufficient statistical power to make meaningful conclusions about group differences. Data should be collected from a range of school settings, including different grade levels, to provide a more complete picture of student discipline. In addition, qualitative research should be completed to understand the course content of alternative certification programs. Directors of the regional service centers who offer these courses should be interviewed to gauge the extent to which they stress classroom management. Future research could also include interviews with campus principals and vice principals to gain their perspectives on the relative effectiveness of alternatively certified teachers.

Additionally, the research literature used showed that the dropout rate was disproportionate in minority communities, particularly when you factor in poverty and English language proficiency. One way to address this issue would be to identify those most at risk of dropping out, find the appropriate supports to help them, and closely monitor who is being disciplined and who is doing the disciplining. It would be interesting to see what effect this would have, not only on student discipline statistics, student discipline referrals, and disciplinary actions, but on overall teacher efficacy and teacher retention.

Final Words

Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy (2001) argued that there was little research that "directly assesses what teachers learn in their pedagogical preparation" (p. 12). They suggested that the research in these areas clearly showed that experienced and newly certified teachers alike see hands-on training in classroom management and student discipline practices as powerful components of teacher preparation (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). In a 2014 infographic provided by the U.S. Department of education, it was reported that 62% of new teachers say that they graduated from their certification program unprepared for the classroom. The same source pointed to a survey of public school principals who affirmed that 72% of new teachers are not prepared to address the needs of students with diverse cultural backgrounds, and that 67% of new teachers are not prepared to maintain order and discipline in the classroom. Focusing on these areas and reconfiguring how we train teachers in both types of certification programs would better equip new teachers and administrators to meet the ever-changing needs of America's schools. In short, a lot needs to be done; but the task is not impossible.

The American Federation of Teachers (2012) stipulated that in order to improve outcomes for new teachers, we must develop an oversight organization for teacher certification and licensure. They suggested that a singular oversight organization was necessary to establish a broadly accepted set of standards, clear, well-defined programs, and a common set of professional assessments to guarantee that only truly qualified teachers enter the classroom, as is the case in other professions. The certifying organization should be made up of predominately teachers and professors of teacher education. Education professionals in the field would take primary responsibility for creating coherent standards, identifying essential teaching practices for beginning teachers, and designing teacher trainings where students are given opportunities to learn and apply these practices. The certifying entity would also be responsible for ensuring assessments effectively identify those who are ready to enter the teaching profession. The logical headquarters for such work would be the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), which currently has widely respected standards for proficient teachers, established by teachers in the field (American Federation of Teachers, 2012, p. 3).

According to the Texas Education Agency's Academic Excellence Indicator System 2012-2013 report on Texas public schools, there were 5,058,939 students enrolled in Texas public schools. Of these students, 3,054,741 (60.4%) received free or reduced meals, which labeled them economically disadvantaged. Also represented in the total population were 2,260,864 (44.7%) students that were considered to be "at risk" of dropping out. These students were also the most likely to be disciplined and sent out of the classroom, or worse, suspended and sent home. As was shown in previous chapters of this dissertation, these over-disciplined students also had a higher incidence of dropping out of school. The Texas Education Agency

(2013) reported the State of Texas annual dropout rate (2011-2012) to be 2.4%. This broke down as follows: 3.8% (African American), 3.1% (Latino), 1.2% (White), 3.5% Special Education), 2.8% (Economically Disadvantaged), and 5.3% (English Learners). On the surface, it is evident that the overall dropout rate that the State of Texas reports was relatively low, but within certain demographics, that rate was much higher.

Interventions of the type mentioned in the previous paragraphs would be best introduced in middle school, the grades where it has been shown that student disciplinary problems begin to have a measurable impact on student's academic outcomes (Losen and Martinez, 2013). In many cases, the academic problems that these students faced often led to their acting out and being repeatedly disciplined. In a 2013 New York City School-Justice Partnership Task Force report on students and the criminal justice system, it was suggested that a new student discipline code be developed that "incorporates guidance interventions and includes a greater emphasis on proactively promoting positive student behavior through an increased focus on school culture, implementation of progressive discipline, including restorative approaches, student engagement and the role of social emotional learning" (p. 30). To support this initiative, the New York City School-Justice Partnership Task Force requested that the New York City Department of Education and its partners should increase training and support for students, teachers, academic leadership, administration, and school safety agents and police officers.

In closing, I feel it necessary to point out that there is no shortage of good ideas and research supporting many of the aforementioned fixes to the problems surrounding insufficient teacher training in classroom management and the harmful effects of zero tolerance student discipline policies and practices. These are well-known issues, and ones that should be

addressed. What was lacking was the will to step outside of the status quo, or the thinking that things will work themselves out over time. They will not. The problems will continue to worsen unless we decide to raise the bar on teacher quality by screening for qualified candidates, putting more resources into better training in classroom management for all certification programs, setting new standards on what it means to be a highly qualified teacher, and lastly re-defining what it means to be a highly qualified teacher. Our schools need to get serious about identifying those teachers who over-discipline students. New accountability measures are targeting teacher effectiveness via test scores. Should we not, given the serious nature of student discipline, track teacher's disciplinary practices as well? The research undertaken for this dissertation provides a way forward in changing the way we train teachers to become more effective classroom mangers and disciplinarians.

Appendix A: Middle School Teacher's Survey

Middle School Teacher Demographic Questions and Survey Questions:

1.) What is your Date of Birth:

2.) What is your Gender?

3.) What is your ethnicity?

4.) What subject/s do you teach?

5.) What grades do you teach?

6.) How long have you been teaching?

7.) What type of teacher certification do you have?

___ Alternative Teacher Certification (example types)

___ Traditional Teacher Certification (example types)

Survey Questions:

1. Describe your teacher certification program

2. Do you feel like you were ready to manage your classroom when you started teaching?

3. What were the biggest challenges that you faced when you first started teaching?

4. Do you feel that there was anything missing in your teacher preparation/training?

5. How do you feel about teaching now?

Appendix B: Discretionary Disciplinary Offenses

1. Using in appropriate language, cursing.

2. Talking back to the teacher/ verbally challenging teacher.*

3. Being tardy to class with no excuse.*

4. Fighting/arguing with another student (no physical harm).*

5. Sleeping in class.

6. Inappropriate clothing, hat, or other item.

7. Talking to other students about content unrelated to class.*

8. Refusing to turn off or turn over device.*

9. Disapproving groans/sighs/statement.*

10. Throwing paper, book, pencil, etc.

* These items were chosen to be represented in the videos.

Appendix C: Student Scenario Tests

Student Scenario Test 1

Teacher: Certification Type (Ethnicity/Sex)	Scenario1: African-American female and Latina having a conversation not related to class during teacher led discussion:	Scenario 2: White male using an electronic device in class during teacher led discussion:	Scenario 3: African-American male disturbing class by challenging teacher on subject of teacher led discussion.	Scenario 4: Latino male and African-American male arguing in class during teacher led discussion.	Scenario 5: White female late to class after bell rang without permission or good reason for tardiness.	Scenario 6: African-American male student not agreeing with teacher decision/grade on test.
A1–Alt Cert (W/M)	3	4	2	3	1	1
B1-Alt Cert (W/F)	3	4	4	4	3	3
C4-Alt Cert (W/M)	3	3	3	4	1	3
E1-Alt Cert (W/F)	4	5	5	5	4	3
F1-Alt Cert (L/F)	4	4	2	4	1	1
A3-Traditional (W/F)	2	2	3	3	1	1
E5-Traditonal (AA/F)	1	1	2	2	1	1

Appendix C. Student Scenario Tests (continued)

Test 1 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 1:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 1	3, 3, 3, 4, 4
Average		1.5	3.4
Difference		1.9 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 2:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	**male**		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 1	4, 4, 3, 5, 4
Average		1.5	4
Difference		2.5 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 3:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher' Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2	2, 4, 3, 5, 2

Average	2.5	3.2
Difference	0.7 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Test 1 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 4:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2	3, 4, 4, 5, 4
Average		2.5	4
Difference		1.5 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 5:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 1	1, 3, 1, 4, 1
Average		1	2
Difference		1 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 6:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	**male**		

female		
Scenario Scores	1, 1	1, 3, 3, 3, 1
Average	1	2.2
Difference	1.2 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Student Scenario Test 2

Teacher: Certification Type (Ethnicity/Sex)	**Scenario 1: Two white males having a conversation not related to class during a teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 2: African-American male using an electronic device in class during teacher led discussion:**	**Scenario 3: White female disturbing class by challenging teacher on subject of teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 4: White female and Latina arguing in class during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 5: African-American male late to class after bell rang without permission or good reason for tardiness.**	**Scenario 6: Latino student not agreeing with teacher decision/grade on test.**
A2-Alt Cert (W/F)	3	4	4	5	2	2
A6-Alt Cert (W/F)	2	2	3	3	2	2
C3-Alt Cert (W/F)	2	3	1	2	2	2
E2-Alt Cert (AA/M)	2	5	1	3	2	4
E4-Alt Cert (AA/M)	1	1	1	2	1	1
A4-Traditional (L/M)	3	3	2	2	1	1
B2-Traditional (L/M)	2	2	2	2	3	2
F2-Traditional (W/M)	3	3	2	2	1	1

Test 2 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 1:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	**male (x 2)**		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2, 2	3, 2, 2, 2, 1
Average		2.3	2
Difference		0.3 (traditionally certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 2:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2, 3	4, 2, 3, 5, 1
Average		2.66	3
Difference		0.34 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 3:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2, 2	4, 3, 1, 1, 1
Average		2	2

Difference	0 (no difference in scores)

Test 2 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 4:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2, 2	5, 3, 2, 3, 2
Average		2	3
Difference		1 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 5:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher' Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 3, 1	2, 2, 2, 2, 1
Average		1.6	1.8
Difference		0.2 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 6:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		

Scenario Scores	1, 2, 1	2, 2, 2, 4, 1
Average	1.3	2.2
Difference	0.9 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Student Scenario Test 3

Teacher: Certification Type (Ethnicity/Sex)	**Scenario 1: Latino male using a device in class during teacher led discussion:**	**Scenario 2: African-American female disturbing class by challenging teacher on subject of teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 3: African-American male and Latino male having a conversation during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 4: Latina female and White female arguing in class during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 5: White male late to class after bell rang without permission or good reason for tardiness.**	**Scenario 6: Latina female not agreeing with teacher decision/grade on test.**
A8-Alt Cert (W/M)	3	2	3	2	3	2
C2-Alt Cert (W/M)	3	3	4	3	2	2
E6-Alt Cert (W/F)	2	2	3	1	1	1
E7-Alt Cert (W/M)	2	2	2	2	2	2
A5-Traditional (L/M)	2	3	2	1	2	1
E8-Traditional (AA/F)	2	1	2	3	3	2

Test 3 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 1:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2	3, 3, 2, 2
Average		2	2.5
Difference		0.5 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 2:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 1	2, 3, 2, 2
Average		2	2.25
Difference		0.25 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 3:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2	3, 4, 3, 2
Average		2	3

Difference	1 (alternatively certified teachers higher)

Test 3 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 4:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 3	2, 3, 1, 2
Average		2	2
Difference		0 (no difference in scores)	

Scenario 5:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	**male**		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 3	3, 2, 1, 2
Average		2.5	2
Difference		0.5 (traditionally certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 6:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher' Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		

Scenario Scores	1, 2	2, 2, 1, 2
Average	1.5	1.75
Difference	0.25 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Student Scenario Test 4

Teacher: Certification Type (Ethnicity/Sex)	**Scenario 1: Latina Female and White female having a conversation during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 2: African-American male using a device in class during teacher led discussion:**	**Scenario 3: Latina female disturbing class by challenging teacher on subject of teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 4: White male and Latino male arguing in class during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 5: African-American female not agreeing with teacher decision/grade on test.**	**Scenario 6: Latino male late to class after bell rang without permission or good reason for tardiness.**
D1-Alt Cert (W/F)	2	3	3	4	2	4
E3-Alt Cert (AA/M)	1	3	5	4	4	2
B4-Traditional (L/F)	2	3	2	3	2	1
C1-Traditional (W/M)	2	3	1	2	2	1

Test 4 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 1:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2	2, 1
Average		2	1.5
Difference		0.5 (traditionally certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 2:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 3	3, 3
Average		3	3
Difference		0 (no difference in scores)	

Scenario 3:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 1	3, 5
Average		1.5	4
Difference		2.5 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Appendix C. Student Scenario Tests (continued)

Test 4 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 4:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2	4, 4
Average		2.5	4
Difference		1.5 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 5:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2	2, 4
Average		2	3
Difference		1 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 6:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 1	4, 2

Average	1	3
Difference	2 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Student Scenario Test 5

Teacher: Certification Type (Ethnicity/Sex)	**Scenario 1: African-American male and Latino having a discussion not related to class during a teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 2: Latino using an electronic device in class during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 3: African-American female disturbing class by challenging teacher on subject of teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 4: Latina and White female arguing in class during teacher led discussion.**	**Scenario 5: White male late to class after bell rang without permission or good reason for tardiness.**	**Scenario 6: Latina not agreeing with teacher decision/grade on test.**
D2-Alt Cert (W/M)	2	3	5	3	1	3
B3-Alt Cert (W/F)	3	5	5	4	3	4
A7-Traditional (AA/F)	3	1	3	2	1	1
B5-Traditonal (L/F)	2	3	1	2	1	1
D3-Traditional (W/F)	3	2	2	3	1	3

Test 5 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 1:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	**male**		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 2, 3	2, 3
Average		2.66	2.5
Difference		0.16 (traditionally certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 2:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	**male**		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 3, 2	3, 5
Average		2	4
Difference		2 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 3:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		3, 1, 2	5, 5
Average		2	5
Difference		3 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Test 5 by race of students in scenarios:

Scenario 4:

Demographics of students in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		2, 2, 3	3, 4
Average		2.33	3.5
Difference		1.17 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 5:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	**male**		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 1, 1	1, 3
Average		1	2
Difference		1 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

Scenario 6:

Demographics of student in scenario		Traditionally Certified Teacher's Scores	Alternatively Certified Teacher's Scores
Ethnicity	Gender		
White	male		
	female		
Latino	male		
	female		
African-American	male		
	female		
Scenario Scores		1, 1, 3	3, 4
Average		1.66	3.5
Difference		1.84 (alternatively certified teachers higher)	

References

American Federation of Teachers. (2012). *Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher Preparation and the teaching profession. A report of the American Federation of Teachers Teacher Preparation Task Force December 2012*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

American Psychological Association. (2008). Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools? An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations. *American Psychologist, 63*, (9), 852-862.

Balfanz, R. Byrnes, V., & Fox, J. (2012). Sent home and put off track: The antecedents, disproportionalities, and consequences of being suspended in the ninth grade. Unpublished manuscript. Center for Civil Rights Remedies national conference: *Closing the School Research Gap: Research to Remedies.*

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1998). The case against teacher certification. *Public Interest, 132*, 17-29.

Becker, G.S. (1975). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Blaug, M. (1976). The empirical status of human capital theory: A slightly jaundiced survey. *Journal of Economic Literature, 14*(3), 827-855.

Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., Rockoff, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2008). The narrowing gap in New York City teacher qualifications and its implications for student achievement in high-poverty schools. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 27*(4), 793-818.

Brookings Institution. (2010). *State of metropolitan America: On the front lines of demographic transformation.* Washington, D.C.: Metropolitan Policy Program.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*, 1–18.

Brophy, J., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *The Elementary School Journal, 93*(1), 3-66.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) 347 U.S. 483 Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka et al. Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas. * No. 1.

Casey, P., Dunlap, K., Brister, H., & Davidon, M. (2011). I only wish I'd known: Voices of novice alternatively certified special education teachers. *International Journal of Special Education, 26*(1), 182-190.

Center for Public Integrity. (2014). *Holder, Duncan stunned by discipline figures.* Retrieved from http://www.publicintegrity.org/2014/03/21/14468/holder-duncan-stunned-discipline-figures

Chambersburg Area School District (2014). Section 504: Frequently Asked Questions & Answers. Retrieved from http://www.casdonline.org/education/components/faq/faq.php?sectiondetailid=25909&#answer_1

Christle, C.A., Jolivette, K., & Nelosn, C.M. (2007). School characteristics related to high school dropout rates. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(6), 325-339.

Chetty, R., Friedman, J., & Rockoff, J. (2011). The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. Cambridge, M.A.: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Clement, M.C. (2002). What cooperating teachers are teaching student teachers about classroom management. *The Teacher Educator*, *38*(1), 47-62.

Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., & Vigdor, J. (2007). How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement? Cambridge, MA: National Bureau for Economic Research.

Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 Standards for accreditation of educator preparation: Annual report to the public, the states, policymakers, and the education profession. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.*

Cousin, G. (2010) Positioning positionality: The reflexive turn. Maggi Savin-Baden & Claire Howell Major (Eds.), *New Approaches to Qualitative Research: Wisdom and Uncertainty* (9-18). New York , NY: Routledge.

Dallas Independent School District. (2013). Alternative certifcation. Retrieved from http://www.dallasisd.org/altcert

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A.E., & Klein, S.P. (1999). *A License to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 166-173.

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(4), 286-302.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31*(9), 13-25.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Policy Brief: Number 1. *Educational opportunity and alternative certification: New evidence and new questions*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Prince, C.D. (2007). Strengthening teacher quality in high-need schools—policy and practice. A report funded by the Joyce Foundation for the Council of Chief State School Officers.

Darling Hammond, L., Amerein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2011). Getting teacher evaluation right: A background paper for policy makers. Washington, DC: Academy of Education and American Educational Research Association.

Davis, J. E., & Jordan, W. J. (1994). The effects of school context, structure, and experiences on African American males in middle and high school. *Journal of Negro Education, 63*(4), 570–587.

Diener-West, M. (2008). Use of the Chi-Square Statistic. Baltimore, Maryland: School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

Donaldson, M.L., & Moore Johnson, S. (2010). The price of misassignment: The role of teaching assignments in Teach For America teachers' exit from low-income schools and the teaching profession. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32*(2), 299-323.

Education Service Center Region 4. (2013). Alternative certification program. Retrieved from http://www.region4acp.net/default.aspx?name=homepage

Education Service Center Region 10. (2013). Teacher preparation and certification. Retrieved from http://www.region10.org/teacher-preparation-and-certification/

Education Service Center Region 13. (2013). Teacher certification. Retrieved from http://www4.esc13.net/certification/teacher-certification/

Education Service Center Region 19. (2013). Alternative education. Retrieved from http://www.esc19.net/alternative_education/

Educational Testing Service. (2012). Texas Educator Certification Program (Data file). Retrieved from http://cms.texes-ets.org/tecprogram/

Education Service Center Region 20. The teacher orientation and preparation program. Retrieved from http://portal.esc20.net/portal/page/portal/esc20public/TOPP

Emmer, E.T., & Stough, L.M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, *36*(2), 103-112.

Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: The measure of effective teaching project. (2013). Seattle, WA: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M.D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M.P., & Booth, E.A.

(2011). *Breaking school's rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to .student's success and juvenile justice involvement.* New York, NY: Council of State Governments Justice Center

Feistritzer, C. E., & Chester, D.T. (2003). Alternative teacher certification: A state-by state analysis, 2003. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education. Retrieved from http://www.ncei.com/index.html

Feistritzer, C.E. (2005). Alternative routes to teacher certification: An overview. National Center for Education Information. Retrieved from http://www.ncei.com/index.html

Fowler, D.F., & Monger, J. (2007). Texas' school to prison pipeline: Dropout to incarceration: The impact of school discipline and zero tolerance. Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed.

Fraser, J.W. (2001). Time to cut the link between teacher preparation and certification? *Education Week, 20*(20), 56-57.

Frey, B.A. (2008). *Promoting classroom management in undergraduate classrooms*. Retrieved from *www.pitt.edu/.../PromotingClassroomManagementSurvey.pdf*

Fuller, E.J. (1999). Does teacher certification matter? A comparison of TAAS performance in 1997 between schools with low and high percentages of certified teachers. Austin, TX: Charles A. Dana Center, University of Texas at Austin.

Goe, L. (2002). Legislating equity: The distribution of emergency permit teachers in California. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(42), 1–50. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n42/

Goe, L. (2007). The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis. Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Goldhaber, D., & D.J. Brewer. 2000. "Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement*." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 22*, 129–145.

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2007). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? National Board Certification as a signal of effective teaching. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 89*(1), 134-150.

Goodwin, A., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M., Reed, R., & Taveras, L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives form practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *65*(4), 284-302.

Green, E. (2010, March 6). Building a better teacher. *The New York Times*, Sunday Magazine, MM30.

Greenberg, J., Walsh, K., & McKee, A. (2014). 2014 Teacher prep review: A review of the nation's teacher preparation programs. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Teacher Quality.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin?. *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 59-68.

Grondin, J. (1995). Sources of hermeneutics. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Haberman, M. (1995). Star teachers of children in poverty. Indianapolis, IN. Kappa Delta Pi.

Hanushek, E. A. 1986. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature, 24*(3): 1141–78.

Hanushek, E. A. 1997. "Assessing the Effects of School Resources on Student Performance: An Update." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *19*(2): 141–64.

Hawley, W.D. (1990). The theory and practice of alternative certification: Implications for the improvement of teaching. *Peabody Journal of Education, 67*(3), 3-34.

Heilig, J. V., & Jez, S. J. (2010). Teach For America: A review of the evidence. *Education Policy Research Unit.*

Hess, F. (2002). Tear down this wall: The case for a radical overhaul of teacher certification. *Educational Horizons*, *80*(4), 169-183.

Huebner, S. (1991) Bias in special education decisions: The contribution of analogue research, *School Psychology Quarterly*, *6*(1), 50–65.

Hurst, A.L. (2008). A healing echo: Methodological reflections of a working class researcher on class. *Qualitative Report*, *13*(3), 334-352.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). Why schools have difficulty staffing their classrooms with qualified teachers?. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 30-33.

Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (May, 2003). "The wrong solution to the teacher shortage" *Educational Leadership, 60*: 8: 30-33.Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support

Institute of Education Sciences. (2009). An evaluation of teachers trained through different routes to certification: Final report (NCEE 2009-4043). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Johnson, S.M., Birkeland, S.E., Peske, H.G., & Munger, M.S. (2005). Project on the Next Generation of Teachers. *A difficult balance: Incentives & quality control in alternative certification programs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Juvonen, J., Le, V. N., Kaganoff, T., Augustine, C. H., & Constant, L. (2004). Focus on the wonder years: Challenges facing the American middle school. Rand Corporation.

Kearns, D. (1990, February28). Do teachers really need licenses? *Wall Street Journal*, p. 14.

Kerlinger, F. (1992) *Foundations of behavioural research*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

Kramer, R, (1991). *Ed school follies: The miseducation of America's teachers*. New York: The Free Press.

Laczko-Kerr, I., & Berliner, D.C. (2002). The effectiveness of "Teach for America" and other under-certified teachers on student academic achievement: A case of harmful public policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *10*(37), 1-53.

Lakis, K., & Maltz, S. (2012). 2012 State teacher policy handbook: Improving teacher Preparation national summary. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Teacher Quality.

Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wykoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *24*(1), 37-62.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Schools Project.

Levine, A. (2013). Fixing how we train U.S. teachers. *The Hechinger Report*. New York, NY: The Hechinger Report.

Liston, D., Borko, H., & Whitcomb, J. (2008). The teacher educator's role in enhancing

teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *59*(2), 111-116.Losen, Daniel J., & Martinez, Tia, E. (2013). Out of school & off track: The overuse of suspensions in American middle and high schools. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project: University of California Los Angeles.

Martin, N.K., & Shoho, A.R. (1999). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between traditional and alternative education programs. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Quebec, Canada.

Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McConney, A., Price, A., & Woods-McConney, A. (2012). Fast track teacher education: A Review of the research literature on" Teach For All" Schemes. *Online Submission*.

Mendez, L. M. R., & Knoff, H. M. (2003). Who gets suspended from school and why: A demographic analysis of schools and disciplinary infractions in a large school district. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *26*(1), 30-51.

Mezirow, J., Darkenwald, G., & Beder, H. (1975). *An evaluation of adult basic education in the state of Iowa; Volume 1: Findings; A perspectives discrepancy assessment, 1974-1975*. New York: Center for Adult Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Morgan, E., Salomon, N., Plotkin, M., & Cohen, r. (2014). *The school discipline consensus report: Strategies form the field to keep students engaged in school and out of the juvenile justice system*. New York, NY: Council of State Governments Justice Center.

National Dropout Prevention Center. (2013). Mentoring/Tutoring: Overview. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center/Network.

National Opportunity to Learn Campaign. (2014). Restorative practices: Fostering healthy relationships & promoting positive discipline in schools: A guide for teachers. Cambridge, MA: Opportunity to Learn Campaign.

New York City School-Justice Partnership Task Force. (2013). Keeping kids in school and out of Court. New York, NY: School Justice Partnership.

Noddings, N. (2012). *An ethic of caring*. Shafer-Landau, R. (Ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Oakes, J., Franke, M., Quartz, K., & Rogers, J. (2002). Research for high-quality urban teaching: Defining it, developing it, assessing it. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(3), 228-234.

Olaniyan, D. A., & Okemakinde, T. (2008). Human capital theory: Implications for educational development. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(5), 479-483.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A Typology of Mixed Methods Sampling Designs in Social Science Research. *Qualitative Report, 12*(2), 281-316.

Pallas, A. (2013). The trouble with NCTQ's ratings of teacher-prep programs. *A Sociological Eye on Education.* New York, NY: The Hechinger Report.

Poulu, M. (2006). The role of vignettes in the research of emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 6*(1), 50-62.

Putnam, M.S. (2009). Grappling with classroom management: The orientations of preservice teachers and the impact of student teaching. *The Teacher Educator*,

44(4), 232-247.

Ravitch, D. (2013). Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Saint George, Donna. (2012, December 13). School-to-prison pipeline' hearing puts spotlight on student discipline. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-13/local/35812364_1_honor-student-school-to-prison-pipeline-civil-rights

Sanchez, C., & Summers, J. (2014). Study delivers failing grades for many programs training Teachers. *nprED*. Washington, D.C.: National Public Radio. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/blogs/ed/2014/06/17/323032745/study-delivers-failing-grades-for-many-programs-training-teachers

Schneider, J. (2013). Rhetoric and practice in pre-service education: The case of Teach For America. Worcester, MA: College of the Holy Cross.

Scribner, J.P., & Heinen, E. (2009). Alternative teacher certification: A program theory analysis. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(2), 179-197.

Shen, J. (1997). Has the alternative certification policy materialized its promise? A comparison between traditionally and alternatively certified teachers in public schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19*(3), 276-283.

Sidani, S., & Sechrest, L (1999). Putting program theory into operation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 20*(2), 227-238.

Skiba, R.J. and Peterson, R.L. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan, 80,* 372-376, 381-382.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review, 34*(4), 317–342.

State Board of Educator Certification. (2011). How to Become a Teacher in Texas. Retrieved from http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/sbeconline/certinfo/becometeacher.asp?width=1680&height=1050#basicreq

Stoddart, T., & Floden, R.E. (1995). *Traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification: Issues, assumptions, and misconceptions*. New York: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Suell, J.L., & Piotrowski, C. (2007). Alternative teacher education programs: A review of the literature and outcome studies. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *34*(1), 54-58.

Sweetland, S.R. (1996). Human capital theory: Foundations of a field of inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, *66*(3), 341-359.

Teach For America (2012). What We Do: Our Approach. Retrieved from http://www.teachforamerica.org/what-we-do/our-approach/

Texas Appleseed. (2007). Texas' school to prison pipeline: Dropout to incarceration: The impact of school discipline and zero tolerance. Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed.

Texas Appleseed. (2010). Texas' school to prison pipeline: School expulsion: The path from lockout to dropout. Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed.

Texas Education Agency. (2013). Academic Excellence Indicator System. Unpublished raw data. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/tapr/2014/state.pdf

Texas Education Agency. (2013). Academic Excellence Indicator System. Unpublished raw data. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/tapr/2013/state.pdf

Texas Education Code. § 21.005. (2009) http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm

The New Teacher Project. (2012). *The irreplaceables: Understanding the real retention crisis in America's urban schools.* Brooklyn, New York: The New Teacher Project.

United States Department of Education. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The Secretary's second annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Education. (2004). Innovations in education: Alternative routes to teacher certification. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/recruit/altroutes/report.pdf

United States. Department of Education. (2011). *No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml

United States Department of Education. (2014). Let's prepare the next generation of great teachers to be ready for America's classrooms (infographic). Retrieved from the United States Department of Education website: http://www.ed.gov/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Teacher-Prep-Infographic.pdf

University of Texas at Austin. (2013). College of education: Teacher certification; Middle grades, secondary, and all-level certification. Retrieved from http://www.edb.utexas.edu/education/programs/certification/howto/secondary/

Valenzuela, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Leaving children behind: How" Texas-style" accountability fails Latino youth*. Suny Press.

Valenzuela, A. (2010). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Suny Press.

Walsh, K. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore, MD: The Abell Foundation.

Walsh, K., & Podgursky, M. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality. A rejoinder.* Baltimore, MD: The Abell Foundation.

Wayman, J.C., Foster, A.M., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Wilson, C. (2003). A comparison of the professional concerns of traditionally prepared and alternatively licensed new teachers. *The High School Journal*, *86*(3), 35-40.

Wetz, James. (2011). *Human Scale Education: Relationships as a Springboard for Learning*. Bristol, United Kingdom: National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services.

Wilson, S., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. A research report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education by the Center for collaboration with Michigan State University. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy: University of Washington.

Vita

Dr. Allen McMurrey earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in History with a Minor in English from the University of Houston in 2000. He received his Master of Arts degree in Curriculum and Instruction in 2004 from the University of Texas San Antonio. In 2005 he joined the Cultural Studies in Education (Curriculum and Instruction) doctoral program at the University of Texas at Austin. In 2007 he switched doctoral programs joining the Public School Executive Leadership Program: Educational Administration, Education Policy and Planning Program.

Before becoming a doctoral student, Dr. McMurrey taught middle school and high school English Language Arts and Reading and Social Studies courses, as well as English as A Second Language in Houston, Galveston, San Antonio, and Austin public schools. While pursuing his degree Dr. McMurrey worked with the University of Texas' Institute for Public School Initiatives in developing content for a statewide online learning platform called Project Share Texas.

Dr. McMurrey was selected to joining the academic honor society of Phi Kappa Phi in 2007. He has authored and co-authored several articles and policy papers as well as developing a student services and staff development model program named Co-Pilot/Compadres. Dr. McMurrey's dissertation, *Middle School Teachers, Certification, Classroom Management, and Student Discipline: A Study of Early Career Teachers in Central Texas Schools* was supervised by Dr. Angela Valenzuela.

Permanent email: amcmurrey@utexas.edu

This dissertation was typed by the author.